

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

**CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

6219

CALL NO. *R* 082 *Cl*a

D.G.A. 79.





(Walter Sturges)

THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

THE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
JOURNAL

VOLUME CVI, FOR THE YEAR 1949,
SUPPLEMENT



6219

MEMORIAL VOLUME

TO

SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM

R 082
Cla

Ref 913
Cla

LONDON:

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE INSTITUTE
c/o LONDON MUSEUM, KENSINGTON PALACE, W.8

1952

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 6219.
Date. 21/6/57.
Call No. 082/cla.

The Council of the Royal Archaeological Institute desire it to be distinctly understood that they are not responsible for any statement or opinion expressed in the *Archaeological Journal*, the authors of the several communications being alone responsible for the same.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introductory Note	vi
Memoir	
By C. A. RALEGH RADFORD	1
The Survival of Gothic in 17th-century England	
By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM	4
The Form of the early Choir of Tewkesbury and its Significance	
By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM	10
Some Minor Irish Cathedrals	
By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM	16
Three Bede-Rolls	
By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM	40
Bibliography	
By VERA M. DALLAS	54
Earthwork since Hadrian Allcroft	
By R. E. M. WHEELER	62
The Statham Book of Hours : an existing MS. mentioned on a 15th-century brass	
By A. R. DUFTY	83
English Cloister Lavatories as independent structures	
By WALTER H. GODFREY	91
William Alnwick, Bishop of Lincoln	
By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON	98
The Sources of the Design of the West Front of Peterborough Cathedral	
By GEOFFREY F. WEBB	113
Index	121

Facsim. - M/S W. Haddon & Co., Cambridge, England - ca. 1850-55 - Pines 12.8-6d.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

Sir Alfred Clapham *Frontispiece*

The Survival of Gothic in 17th-century England :

Bishop Auckland : Chapel of Bishop's Palace, formerly the Great Hall ...	<i>opp.</i>	4
Oxford, Christ Church : vault of Great Staircase	<i>opp.</i>	4
Oxford, Brasenose College : plaster vault in Chapel	<i>opp.</i>	5
Burford Priory Chapel : S.W. and N.W. windows	<i>opp.</i>	6
Warwick, St. Mary's Church, exterior from the S.E.	<i>opp.</i>	7
London, Church of St. Mary Aldermary : from the S.E.	<i>opp.</i>	7
Staunton Harold Church : nave looking E.	<i>opp.</i>	8

The Form of the Early Choir of Tewkesbury and its Significance :

Tewkesbury Abbey : Presbytery piers	<i>opp.</i>	10
Tewkesbury Abbey : E. wall of S. Transept from the W.	<i>opp.</i>	11
Romsey Abbey : N. arcade of Nave from S. Transept	<i>opp.</i>	11
Jedburgh Abbey : W. Bay of Presbytery from S.	<i>opp.</i>	12
St. Thomas d'Épernon : elevation and section of choir arcade	<i>opp.</i>	12
St. Thomas d'Épernon : plan and longitudinal section... ..	<i>opp.</i>	13
Dunstable Priory : Nave from S.W.	<i>opp.</i>	13
Tewkesbury Abbey : reconstruction of late 11th-century choir arcade ...		14
Tewkesbury Abbey : details of Presbytery and Nave arcades		15

Some Minor Irish Cathedrals :

Killaloe Cathedral : plan		17
Clonmacnois Cathedral : plan		18
Clonfert Cathedral : plan		19
Tuam Cathedral : plan		20
Tuam Cathedral (1862)	<i>opp.</i>	21
Tuam Cathedral : Choir from S.E.	<i>opp.</i>	21
Kilmacduagh Cathedral : plan		21
Ardfert Cathedral : plan		22
Ardfert Cathedral : interior of Chancel	<i>opp.</i>	24
Kildare Cathedral and Round Tower	<i>opp.</i>	24
Kildare Cathedral : plan		25
Leighlin Cathedral : views from N.E. and S.E.	<i>opp.</i>	25
Leighlin Cathedral : plan		27
Limerick Cathedral : plan		29
Waterford Cathedral : plan		31
Pier in Waterford Cathedral : plan and section		32
Waterford Cathedral, interior and exterior (18th century)	<i>opp.</i>	32
Kilkenny Cathedral, interior and exterior	<i>opp.</i>	33
Kilkenny Cathedral : plan		34

	PAGE
Kilkenny Cathedral: tomb in North Transept ...	opp. 34
Cloyne Cathedral: South Transept ...	opp. 35
Cloyne Cathedral: East wall of South Transept ...	opp. 35
Cloyne Cathedral: plan ...	35
Ferns Cathedral from S.E. (1786) ...	opp. 36
Ferns Cathedral: north wall of eastern building ...	opp. 36
Ferns Cathedral: plan ...	38
Earthwork since Hadrian Allcroft:	
Sketch-map of <i>muri Gallici</i> in France and Switzerland ...	71
Fragment of a typical <i>murus Gallicus</i> in Brittany, showing nailed timbering and pierced stone revetment ...	73
The Statham Book of Hours:	
John Statham (1454) and Cicely his wife. Brass in Morley Church, Derbyshire ...	opp. 84
Prayers from the Office of the Dead ...	opp. 86
Agreement between the Prior of Breadsall Priory and John Statham ...	opp. 87
The Statham Obit Reminder brass, c. 1454 ...	88
English Cloister Lavatories as independent structures:	
Comparative plans of monastic Lavatories ...	93
Lewes Priory: fragment of Laver and shafts of Lavatory ...	opp. 94
Much Wenlock Abbey: panels from the Lavatory ...	opp. 94
Christ Church, Canterbury: Water Tower ...	opp. 95
Lavatory at the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaça, Portugal ...	opp. 95
The Sources of the Design of the West Front of Peterborough Cathedral:	
West Transept and Portico, Peterborough Cathedral ...	114
West Front of Lincoln Cathedral ...	115
Section of West Transept and Portico, Peterborough Cathedral...	opp. 116
West Front of Lincoln Cathedral in the 12th century ...	opp. 117
Peterborough Cathedral: West Front ...	opp. 118

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This volume is dedicated to the memory of our former President, Alfred Clapham. It includes *in primis* four papers recovered by the piety of his friends largely from miscellaneous material left by him in manuscript, and their names should be honoured with his own. First among them is that of Miss Vera M. Dallas, who has given a general oversight to the matter, and a good deal more than oversight to the articles on 'The Survival of Gothic' and 'The Early Choir of Tewkesbury'. To the latter Monsieur Jean Bony has also contributed much helpful advice, and Mr. Norman Drinkwater an essential plan drawn out by Miss Dallas. The editing of the paper on 'Three Bede-Rolls' has been undertaken by Dr. Rose Graham; and others who have assisted in one way or another include Dr. Margaret Whinney, Mr. E. S. de Beer, Mr. A. R. Dufty, Mr. Walter H. Godfrey and Mr. G. F. Webb. A special note may be added on the paper on 'Some Minor Irish Cathedrals'. In 1939 Clapham contributed to the *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter* an article on this subject. After the war it was his intention to publish an extended version of the paper, covering all the medieval Irish cathedrals outside Dublin. By 1950 he had made considerable progress with the work. In addition to Limerick, Tuam, Kilmacduagh, Clonfert, Leighlin and Clonmacnois, which are described in the published article, he had written accounts of Ardfert, Emly, Ferns and Kildare. Other cathedrals visited in recent years include Cashel, Cloyne, Cork, Killaloe, Newtown Trim, Ross Carbery and Waterford. For several of these his architectural notes were complete, leaving only the checking of historical and other references to be done. The accounts already written have been printed as they stand, with such slight alterations as were necessary to fit the earlier publication into the enlarged article. It has further seemed desirable to write up accounts of those buildings of which Clapham's notes were most nearly complete. This has been done for Cloyne, Cork, Kilkenny, Ross Carbery and Waterford. As far as possible these accounts have been confined to statements and judgments recorded in Clapham's notebooks, only sufficient being added to make the description readable. The editing of this article has been carried out by Mr. H. G. Leask and Mr. C. A. Raleigh Radford, whilst Miss Dallas has drawn most of the plans.

Thanks are also due to the Syndics of the Harvard University Press for permission to reproduce Figs. 1-5 and 9 and Pls. X, A, B, and XII A, C, which appeared in the Kingsley Porter Memorial Volume. Fig. 12 is reproduced by kind permission of the author, Mr. H. G. Leask, and of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland. Leave to reproduce

the painting in Bishopsgrrove, Waterford, was kindly granted by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Waterford. Other help in connection with illustrations has been received from the National Buildings Record, *Country Life*, and Mr. F. T. Power.

Of the remaining papers in the volume it will suffice to record here that Miss Kathleen Major has very kindly provided most of the footnotes to Professor Hamilton Thompson's article on 'William Alnwick'.

Finally the Council of the Royal Archaeological Institute wishes to acknowledge the Grant made towards the cost of the publication of Sir Alfred's papers by the Council for British Archaeology.

R. E. M. WHEELER,

President

November, 1951

MEMOIR

By C. A. R. RADFORD

The death of Sir Alfred Clapham robs archaeology of a scholar whom it can ill spare. Clapham was an acknowledged master in his chosen field, the study of Pre-Conquest and Romanesque architecture and sculpture. His work was distinguished by a careful observation of significant detail, critically and imaginatively interpreted in the light of the relevant parallels, and a sound knowledge of the historical sources. These combined to make his architectural studies both lucid and authoritative. Much of his writing was necessarily of a technical character, but the three books on Romanesque architecture revealed a power of generalization which made them eminently readable.

Alfred William Clapham was born in 1883, the son of the Reverend J. E. Clapham and Elizabeth Hutchinson. He was educated at Dulwich. On leaving school he entered the architectural profession and was articled to Mr. James Weir. His main interest turned to the historical side of his studies and he spent some years working for the Victoria County History. In 1912 he joined the staff of the newly formed Royal Commission on Historical Monuments in England and the rest of his professional life was spent in the service of that body. After an interruption due to the war of 1914-8 he became Technical Editor; in 1933 he succeeded the late Sir George Duckworth as Secretary, a post which he held till his retirement in 1948. It is not too much to say that the Inventories published by this Commission in the period between the two world wars achieved their high standing in the learned world through the accurate scholarship and careful editing of Sir Alfred Clapham. A few of the prefaces bear his signature; others are clearly his work. But every page of these volumes shews the trace of his hand. This great corpus of material covering several English counties, accurately described, logically and coherently set out and magnificently illustrated, has set a new standard in the preparation and publication of such surveys, a standard that owes to the guiding hand more than could be acknowledged in the formal reports that introduce the volumes.

Clapham's personal predilections were most fully expressed in his studies of ecclesiastical and monastic architecture and sculpture. These are to be found in the Journals of many learned societies—our own among them. The list which accompanies this memoir will best indicate the extent and importance of his contributions to medieval research. Here we can mention only a few, chosen at random to illustrate the range of his interests and the extent of his knowledge. The study of the Latin Priory of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, which opens the first volume of the *Antiquaries Journal*, was the result of service in Palestine at the end of the first war. The publication of the Pre-Conquest sculptures at Breedon in Leicestershire opened a new vista, identifying and describing the hitherto unrecognized Mercian school of the 8th

century. The comprehensive treatment of the buildings of the Order of Grandmont and of the Irish Cistercians well illustrate both his detailed knowledge and his power of lucid synthesis. A slighter contribution to the study of Glastonbury Abbey is equally characteristic with its careful record of the excavated building and its accurate comparison of the ruined hypogeum with the classic example at Poitiers, a comparison that could only have been made by one familiar with the many types of early Christian architecture.

These and other articles were written primarily for specialists; the three books on the Romanesque style were intended for a wider public. The two earlier volumes carry the story down from the beginning of English church building by the Augustinian Mission to the end of the 12th century, when Romanesque was displaced by the Gothic style. They illustrate our architecture and sculpture over a period of 600 years, presenting the main lines of development in a clear, comprehensive story, and placing in its proper perspective that wealth of variation which both charms and bewilders the student. Romanesque architecture in Western Europe carries out the same task in a wider field. It remains the only survey of the whole subject which is both comprehensive and authoritative.

These books, like the more specialized articles, were the fruit of a wide experience. Clapham knew every part of England. Mention of a monastic site or an early church would generally elicit some helpful comment, based on a personal observation of the remains, even of those lost in the remoter corners of the country. He was also well acquainted with Ireland and Scotland. On the Continent his interests had first led him to France, a land where he found the life and outlook of the people congenial. For many years he was a member of the *Congrès archéologique*, attending the annual conferences held in different parts of the country. The knowledge gained from these excursions was supplemented by frequent journeys, in the course of which he penetrated into little known places, studying the architecture and sculpture of the deserted churches which form one of the glories of rural France. His acquaintance with the other western countries was less extensive, but he had visited the more important of the early buildings while preparing his book on the European Romanesque. Here he was helped by his wide knowledge of the modern literature, a knowledge that enabled him to decide between those churches which would add to his understanding and those which, however lovely, had little to teach. This is not to suggest that he was insensitive to such considerations. His study of architecture and sculpture was essentially based on the intrinsic beauty of the work, and where opportunity offered he was catholic in his tastes.

Clapham was elected to the Society of Antiquaries in 1913 and to the British Academy in 1935. He served on the Antiquaries' Council on many occasions, becoming Secretary in 1929 and President for the term

1939-44. His work in the field of medieval studies was recognized by the award of the Society's Gold Medal. As President his term of office was overshadowed by the war with its resultant problems of evacuation and reorganization. He took a leading part in the foundation of the Council for British Archaeology, which was set up in 1944, and served as its first President. His success in that office led to his reappointment in 1949. He then served for a further year till ill health forced his resignation.

The members of the Royal Archaeological Institute will have felt a more personal sense of loss. Clapham joined as a member in 1921 and served for many years on the Council and as a Vice-President. He was elected President in 1945, undertaking this burden in a difficult period of transition. The successful emergence of the Institute and its reorganization after the difficulties of the years of war was due in no small measure to his foresight and tact. But many of us will remember him best on the Annual Excursions, when his contributions to the programme and his brief scholarly descriptions of buildings added so much to the enjoyment of those present.

THE SURVIVAL OF GOTHIC IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM

The last phase of medieval architecture in England, generally called Tudor, was the logical development of the style which had been universal in the country since the close of the 14th century. It is distinguished by the predominance of the vertical line (which gave it its popular name of Perpendicular), by the more and more extensive use of stone panelling and by the general abandonment of the pointed or two-centred arch for the depressed four-centred form. With these features the more ambitious types of building combined that very English form of roofing—the fan-vault. In this vault, which originated in the 14th century, the structural functions of the rib and the web were abandoned, the whole vault being jointed like a piece of stone panelling, with the rib and web cut in the same piece. In the Tudor phase of this style, all the more florid features were carried, where finances allowed, to their extreme limit, and Henry VII's chapel at Westminster forms an admirable monument of this last phase of English medieval architecture.

The dissolution of the monasteries and the adoption of Reformed principles put a sudden brake on church building, but did not stop it altogether. Thus, in the city of London, the church of St. Giles, Cripplegate, was largely rebuilt shortly after a fire in 1545, and its features are indistinguishable from building of the early part of the century. The general stagnation, however, in ecclesiastical building extended through most of the second half of the 16th century, and the Elizabethan renaissance, though exemplified in many stately houses, is but little reflected in church-building.


The renewed activity, with which we are immediately concerned, was directly connected with the Anglican church revival which, in its turn, owed much to the strong will and intolerant policy of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury (1583-1604). Under him and his successors, down to Archbishop Laud (executed 1645), the Anglican church achieved and maintained a position alike cohesive and predominant which only crumbled under the united attacks of non-conformity and democracy. Laud alone might have survived the storm, but Laud and Charles together were unable to weather it.

The domestic architecture, current in England during the second half of the 16th century, had little in common with the severity and correctness of the Italian Renaissance. Classical proportions and correct detail were reserved for the designer of funeral monuments or for minor details of decorative work. It was not until the advent of Inigo Jones that the pure Palladian style was introduced into England.


The intellectual Renaissance of the 16th century had been as powerful and all-embracing in England as elsewhere in Europe, but it had had little effect on architectural taste, and the most casual perusal of such



A. BISHOP AUCKLAND : CHAPEL OF BISHOP'S PALACE, FORMERLY THE GREAT HALL
(Photo: National Buildings Record)



B. OXFORD, CHRIST CHURCH : VAULT OF GREAT STAIRCASE
(Photo: Royal Commission on Historical Monuments)



OXFORD, BRASENOSE COLLEGE : PLASTER VAULT IN CHAPEL.

(Photo: Royal Commission on Historical Monuments)

material as Evelyn's diary will show that educated English taste in the middle of the 17th century not only displayed no aversion from the Gothic manner, but expressed on many occasions a lively admiration for it, differentiating only between the two styles as being 'of the old' or 'the new manner'.

A few extracts will sufficiently explain this attitude. Referring to Gloucester, Evelyn says: 'The minster is indeed a noble fabric'¹; to Newstead, 'It has yet remaining the front of a glorious abbey church'²; to York, 'It is a most entire magnificent piece of Gothic architecture'³; and to Salisbury, 'The cathedral I take to be the completest piece of Gothic work in Europe taken in all its uniformity. The pillars, reputed to be cast, are of stone manifestly cut out of the quarry'.⁴

Such then was the general attitude to Gothic art down to the Restoration (1660) and even later; it was not until the reign of Queen Anne that the term Gothic became synonymous with barbaric, and the art suffered an eclipse which was only made the more apparent by the dilettante romanticism of Horace Walpole and others of his age.

The phase of Gothic with which we have to deal may be considered then, with considerable justice, to be the architectural expression of the Anglican church of the reigns of James I and Charles I. It was patronised by the heads of that church and flourished most tropically in that stronghold of Anglicanism—the University of Oxford.

Let us turn then first to Oxford and consider the chief surviving examples of 17th-century Gothic in that University. The earliest of these is the entirely new college-foundation of Wadham, founded by Nicholas Wadham and his wife and built in 1610–13. The chapel here is of the traditional Oxford form with an ante-chapel, and the gatehouse has the earliest of the 17th-century fan-vaults which became so favourite a feature of the Oxford building of the period. Next in date comes the building of the Schools Quadrangle with its fan-vaulted gatehouse of 1613. Both at this structure and at Wadham the design includes an example of those centre-pieces of four or five superimposed Classical orders which were a concession to the newer taste. The rebuilding of Oriel College included the fan-vaulted gatehouse of 1620–22 and the chapel of 1642 of the same plan as Wadham. The former chapel at Exeter was built in 1624 and destroyed by Sir Gilbert Scott in 1854. Lincoln College Chapel was built in 1629–31 and richly furnished; its six-light east and three-light side windows are all of 15th-century character. A description of a visit to Oxford in 1636 by George Garrard, chaplain to the Earl of Northumberland, gives particular commendation

¹ *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, July 31st, 1654. Evelyn's attitude to Gothic seems to have hardened in the course of his life and these quotations may be contrasted with his remarks in the second version of his 'Account of Architects' (Evelyn, *Miscellaneous Writings*, pp. 366, 367, first printed 1707 but most likely

written c. 1695). This information has been kindly supplied by Mr. E. S. de Beer, who has also checked the quotations from Evelyn from the original.

² *Ibid.*, August 13th, 1654.

³ *Ibid.*, August 17th, 1654.

⁴ *Ibid.*, July 20th, 1654.

to this chapel.¹ He remarks that 'the churches or chapels of all the colleges are much beautified—extraordinary cost bestowed on them. Scarce any cathedral churches, not Windsor or Canterbury, nay, not Paul's quire, exceeds them. Most of them new-glazed; richer glass for figures and painting I have not seen, which they had most from beyond the seas'. Much of this building activity was, no doubt, due to Archbishop Laud, at that time Chancellor of the University and himself a great builder at St. John's. The Convocation House, with its fan-vault, was built in 1634-7, and the gatehouse at University College, with a similar vault in 1635-7. To about the year 1640 belongs the finest of all these works in Oxford—the vault of the staircase at Christ Church (Plate I*B*), designed by one 'Smith an artificer of London'. Its proportions and details are alike admirable and might well be mistaken for medieval work. John Evelyn in 1654 notes that 'the ample hall and column, that spreads its capital to sustain the roof as one goes up the stairs, is very remarkable'.² This was the last important work at Oxford before the outbreak of the Civil War, but it is a remarkable testimony to the strength of the tradition that the new chapel at Brasenose, built in 1656-9, held so closely to the old manner, and that Sir Christopher Wren's completion of Tom Tower at Christ Church (1682-3) was entirely in the Gothic manner. The chapel at Brasenose has a remarkable plaster vault (Plate II) hung on to a re-used medieval roof; it was designed by the overseer of the works, John Jackson. The second gatehouse at University College closes the series of Oxford fan-vaults; it was built in 1716-9.³

The Gothic tradition in London was either not so strong as at Oxford or had fewer opportunities for expression. This conclusion, however, should be qualified by the consideration that more than three-quarters of the London churches were destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666 (86 out of 107). Of those that survived, St. Catherine Cree had been largely rebuilt in 1628; the design of this rebuilding has been ascribed with insufficient evidence to Inigo Jones⁴; it is a queer hybrid with classical arcades, a rose-window of 14th-century character in the east end, and ribbed plaster vaults of the flattest form and of late Gothic type. The chapel of Lincoln's Inn⁵ (1620-23) was certainly designed by Inigo Jones and has Perpendicular windows and an elaborately vaulted undercroft. St. Alban, Wood Street, rebuilt by Inigo Jones in 1633-4, was much damaged in the Great Fire and repaired or rebuilt in 1682-7

¹ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, 1636-7, pp. 113-4; given more fully in the Preface, p. xxiii.


² *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn* July 12th, 1654.

³ With the Oxford examples should be mentioned William Lenthall's remarkable chapel at Burford Priory, where the building is in the classical manner, but the windows are striking examples of 17th-century Gothic, using and discarding with complete impartiality the cusps

that are so effective in the rose window and so conspicuous by their absence from the remaining tracery (Plate III*A*, *n*). (Note by Mr. W. H. Godfrey.)


⁴ For discussion of this see *St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, v, 190, 'The Church of St. Catherine Cree', by Philip Norman.

⁵ *Black Books of Lincoln's Inn* (Edition 1898), ii, 199, January 27th, 1618; 209, November 12th, 1618. Research undertaken since this paper was written has caused doubt on this statement.




A. BURFORD PRIORY CHAPEL : S.W. WINDOW

(Photos : National Buildings Record)



B. BURFORD PRIORY CHAPEL : N.W. WINDOW



B. LONDON, CHURCH OF ST. MARY
ALDERMARY : FROM THE S.E.
(Photo : Royal Commission on Historical Monuments)



A. WARWICK, ST. MARY'S CHURCH : EXTERIOR
FROM THE S.E.
(Photo : National Buildings Record)

by Sir Christopher Wren. It has windows of Jacobean Gothic type and a ribbed plaster vault.

As we have seen, Sir Christopher Wren employed the Gothic taste in the completion of Tom Tower at Oxford, and a few of his London churches partake of the same character. It seems reasonably certain that, where no existing building controlled the design, both Inigo Jones and Wren would not of their own volition have adopted the Gothic style, and that in their churches designed in the older manner their clients had the determining voice in the matter. Thus the church of St. Mary, Aldermary, was rebuilt after the Great Fire from a bequest of Henry Rogers conditional to its being a copy of the earlier church (Plate IVB). This building is the most successful of Wren's Gothic designs, and here he seems to have endeavoured with some enthusiasm to reproduce the features of Tudor Gothic. The elaborate fan-vaulted ceilings of plaster are, however, much heavier and less adroit than those of Oxford. Wren's other Gothic works in London include the tower and spire of St. Dunstan in the East of 1698, and the tower of St. Michael, Cornhill, 1715-21. The former has a central spire on four flying arches, copied from the similar feature at St. Nicholas, Newcastle. The tower at St. Michael, Cornhill, was nearly a replica of its predecessor.

All these works, however, are the designs of a professional architect, and are important for our purpose rather as evidence for the strength of popular tradition than as examples of the vernacular style. This is better seen in the considerable series of small village churches scattered over the country but, before passing on to them, a word should be said as to the building activities of James Montagu, Bishop of Bath and Wells from 1608 to 1616. He found the abbey or, more properly, the cathedral, at Bath largely roofless and unfinished since its reconstruction had been begun by Bishop King a century before; the Tudor style of the original building with its fan-vaulting has been so carefully reproduced in the new work as to make it difficult to distinguish between the two periods. Bishop Montagu lies buried in the new work of his nave. Another bishop of a rather later period who maintained the old taste in building was John Cosin, Bishop of Durham (1660-70).¹ His most remarkable work was the reconstruction of the 13th-century Great Hall at his Palace of Bishop Auckland as a chapel. He retained the earlier arcades, but added a clearstory and replaced all the windows; the end and aisle windows are remarkable examples of decorated tracery of 14th-century type (Plate IA). The roof and fittings of the chapel are of the same age, and the bishop was also responsible for the towering semi-Gothic canopy of the font in his cathedral.

Turning now to the minor examples of the period, I may first note

¹ Agreements between the Bishop and various craftsmen, from 1662 onwards, are given in the *Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D.*, ii, Surtees Soc., lv, 1870, pp. 356-382. Cosin's taste for the

medieval is illustrated by his insistence on battlements on his proposed Commencement House and Library for Cambridge University. *Ibid.*, pp. 383-4. (Note by Dr. M. D. Whitney.)

as amongst the earliest the chapel at Groombridge (Kent) built by John Packer as an inscription states : ' In gratitude for the safe return of Charles, Prince of Wales, from Spain ', in 1623. (The initials of the builder, I. P., were defaced and his own substituted by a certain William Carnfield, on the grounds that he had whitewashed the church, late in the 18th century.) This simple chapel has a five-light east window of perpendicular character and a Renaissance porch.

A much more imposing building is the church of St. John at Leeds (Yorks.),¹ built entirely by John Harrison and consecrated by Archbishop Neale on September 21st, 1634. It takes the form of a handsome late Gothic parish church, and the retention of its elaborate woodwork, pews and screens render its interior a remarkably rich example of the period.

Numerous churches all over the country retain towers, chapels or other features of this period, but need not be particularised. The towers of Charlton and Plumstead (Kent) and Hillingdon (Middlesex) may, however, be mentioned, as being in the immediate neighbourhood of London.

Even during the Commonwealth (1649-60), in remote parts of the country, churches continued to be built in the traditional style, and certainly not for purposes of nonconformist worship.

The chapel at Staunton Harold (Leicestershire) was built by Sir Robert Shirley in 1653. The inscription, over the west door, no doubt added when it was safe to do so, declared : ' When all things sacred throughout the nation were either demolished or prophaned Sir Robert Shirley, Bart., founded this church whose singular praise it is, to have done the best things in the worst time '. The chapel is predominantly perpendicular in character, but the east window has more 14th-century inspiration. It survives to-day, with practically the whole of its fittings (Plate V), as it was erected in the middle of the 17th century and is among the most attractive monuments of its age.


At Brampton Bryan, in Herefordshire, the siege of the castle in 1643 caused the ruin of the neighbouring church. It was rebuilt by Sir Robert Harley in 1656 and has a somewhat remarkable double hammer-beam roof of the period.

Finally, some reference must be made to that remarkable lady—Lady Anne Clifford, the last of one of the great medieval families of the north, who maintained a feudal state on her great possessions in Yorkshire and Westmorland. She survived until 1676 and, a stout Royalist, proved too redoubtable an opponent to be subdued by the local parliamentary authorities during the Commonwealth. This lady spent much of her considerable wealth in restoring the medieval castles of her domain, Brougham, Brough and Pendragon, and she rebuilt at Brougham the chapel of St. Wilfrid in 1658 and the parish church in 1660. These are

¹ *Thoresby Soc.* Volume xxiv, 190, ' The Church of St. John the Evangelist ', by J. E. Stocks.



STAUNTON HAROLD CHURCH : NAVE LOOKING E.
(Copyright "Country Life")



unpretentious late Gothic churches of local type and her extensive restorations in the two churches at Appleby are of the same character. Gabriel Vincent was the chief director of her building. She had, however, outlasted her age. Bishop Rainbow's remark about her clothes: 'her dress not disliked by any was yet imitated by none' might be applied to her taste in buildings and, after her death, her border strongholds, castles and towers, fell into immediate decay or were almost immediately rebuilt to accord with the taste of the age.

The almost universal adoption of the Palladian style for domestic buildings from the Restoration onwards was reflected, with the lag of a generation or more, in ecclesiastical building throughout the country. It cannot be doubted that the remarkable achievements of Sir Christopher Wren in the rebuilding of the cathedral and parish churches of London after the Great Fire contributed largely to the triumph of the 'new manner', and after the turn of the century examples of Gothic become almost entirely the experiments of professional architects in a field which they entirely misunderstood. One building may perhaps carry on the tradition into the 18th century, the nave of St. Mary Warwick (Plate IVA). This was burnt in 1694 and the new church was, according to the inscription, 'begun and continued by public and finished by royal piety under the joyful auspices of Queen Anne in the memorable year 1704'. (Blenheim) (The semi-Gothic design is ascribed to Sir William Wilson).

The sham ruin of the 18th century, hardly more substantial than a stage property, marks the final degradation of Gothic and the architectural whims of a Horace Walpole and a Beckford form but an unstable bridge between the old Gothic and the new.

THE FORM OF THE EARLY CHOIR OF TEWKESBURY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

By Sir ALFRED CLAPHAM

The group of major churches in the counties of Gloucester and Worcester, which is distinguished by the colossal order of the cylindrical piers of the nave, has long aroused both interest and speculation which have, however, been largely unsatisfied. It is not the intention of this paper to attempt any solution of the problem of the origin of the colossal order, which has been considered by M. Jean Bony in the *Bulletin monumental* (1937).¹ The intention is rather to arrive, firstly, at the form of the bay-design of the late 11th-century presbytery at Tewkesbury, and secondly, to consider what influence this design had elsewhere.

The group of churches, with which we are concerned, consists of the Abbeys of Gloucester, Tewkesbury and Pershore, and perhaps also the Abbey of Evesham. All are reasonably well documented except Pershore.

The church at Gloucester was begun in 1089 and consecrated in 1100; the completion of the nave was probably marked by the consecration in 1121. Tewkesbury was begun after 1087, and must have been well advanced by 1102 when the convent moved here from Cranbourne. Pershore abbey-church was re-entered in 1102 after a fire, and it would appear probable that this marks the completion of the eastern arm and transepts. The church at Evesham was begun soon after 1077 under Abbot Walter, a monk of Cerisy, who built the crypt, the eastern arm, the transepts and crossing as far as the nave before his death in 1086. Reginald, abbot from 1122 to 1149, built the greater part of the walls of the nave as can 'now' be recognized.² It follows from these particulars that the four buildings were nearly contemporary, the destroyed church at Evesham being somewhat earlier than the rest.

The building of the presbytery begun at Tewkesbury after 1087, now survives only in regard to the cylindrical piers and the respond walling adjoining the central tower. The cylindrical piers (6½ ft. diam.) now stand 13½ ft. above the pavement of the presbytery and up to the 14th-century moulded capitals (Plate VI A). That the whole of this work, below the later capitals, belongs to the late 11th-century structure is apparent from the setting and tooling of the masonry of the piers themselves, which shew no alteration in treatment from the base upwards. The most significant feature to be noted is, however, the treatment towards the aisle and ambulatory. Here the existing 14th-century

¹ *Société française d'archéologie* (Paris, 1937).

² *Chronicon Abbatiae de Evesham*, edited by W. D. Macray, Rolls Series, London, 1863, pp. 97-99. The two important passages are: 1, about Abbot Walter (1077-1086): 'Fecit etiam cryptas et ecclesiam superius usque ad navem, excepta turri quam non perfecit nisi


arcus et primas fenestras . . . ' (p. 99). 2, about Abbot Reginald (1122-1149): 'Magnam etiam partem murorum navis ecclesiae sicut adhuc distingui potest fecit . . . ' (pp. 98-9). The nave was completed under Abbot Adam (1160-1191).




A. TEWKESBURY ABBEY : PIERS ON S. SIDE OF PRESBYTERY
(Photo F. H. Crocker)



B. TEWKESBURY ABBEY : DETAIL OF PRESBYTERY PIER
(Photo Shirley Jones)



A. TEWKESBURY ABBEY : E. WALL OF S. TRANSEPT
FROM THE W.
(Photo : Summer)



B. ROMSEY ABBEY : N. ARCADE OF NAVE FROM S. TRANSEPT
(Photo : F. H. Crossley)

aisle-vaults spring from late 11th-century moulded corbelling, on the piers, 2 ft. below the 14th-century capital towards the presbytery. Furthermore, this corbelling has been roughly cut back to the cylinder-surface where it had become purposeless. Also cut back to the cylinder-surface are the ashlar springers of an arch following the line of the arcade. These features occur on all the piers of the presbytery and apse (Plate VIB). M. Jean Bony in his paper on 'Tewkesbury et Pershore : deux élévations à quatre étages' has assumed that the corbelling towards the aisle represents the level of the springing of the main arcade of the presbytery, and restores the presbytery elevation at Tewkesbury on the lines of that still existing in the east wall of the transept of the same church (Plate VIIA)—that is to say, with a main arcade of normal height, a tribune above,² a triforium passage at a still higher level and a clearstory with a single light in each bay. In its general lines there is no reason to quarrel with this interpretation, which M. Bony was the first to analyse and comment upon. It does not, however, take account of the continuation to a higher level, on the presbytery side, of the cylindrical piers, 2 ft. above the corbelling, until they are cut off by the 14th-century capitals. Of this feature there can, I think, be but one logical explanation and this, if accepted, indicates that the Tewkesbury masons were perhaps the first to evolve and employ that curious feature of the combined main arcade and tribune which was adopted at an appreciably later date in a number of English churches and one Scottish church.

This system involves the springing of the main arcade from the rear or aisle half of the face of the cylindrical pier in two or more recessed orders and forming together a wall of rather more than half the thickness of the main side walls of the presbytery. Above the main arcade was the open arch or arches of the tribune, above the level of the aisle vault; the openings were of the same thickness as the main arcade below. The inner (or presbytery) face of the cylindrical piers was at the same time carried up and finished with a capital at the level of the springing of the arches of the tribune, and an arch was thrown across in advance of the face of this second stage, thus restoring the main side-walls of the superstructure to their full thickness. The scheme thus included in appearance, if not in actual fact, the colossal order of the nave-arcade, the cylindrical piers in the presbytery being presumably of much the same height (28 ft.) as those of the nave; they supported a superior arcade which enclosed the main and tribune-arches below, which thus became architecturally subordinate to the main double storey. Above this we may accept the triforium-arcade and the clearstory as restored by M. Bony from the surviving work in the transept.

¹ See Note 1, p. 10.

² The term *tribune* here used applies to a full gallery covering the whole width of the aisle or ambulatory over which it is built and lit by windows which, from the outside, make a second storey of openings in the outer walls


of the aisles. In this new terminology the term *triforium* is applied only to a row of smaller openings (or even a blind arcading) which does not correspond to a full gallery, but only to a lean-to roof covering either the aisles or, in the case of a four-storeyed elevation, the tribunes.

The crucial evidence for the former existence of the colossal order, of two storeys, in the presbytery has been indicated above. The surviving corbelling together with the cut-back arch-springers proves conclusively that the aisle was vaulted at this level and that the inner order of the main arcade sprang also from the same level. Beyond a certain point, however, the cutting back of the springers on the cylindrical piers ceases, and is replaced by the plain ashlar surfaces of the pier itself carried up 2 ft. higher until cut off by the 14th-century rebuilding. This again proves conclusively that the inner face (towards the presbytery) of the cylinders continued up, an unknown distance, above the inner order of the main arcade, and equally that the main arcade did not extend in thickness across the pier to the inner face. That such an ordinance, as I have indicated above, was adopted elsewhere, not long after the building of Tewkesbury, is indicated by the surviving bays in the nave at Romsey Abbey, Hants. (Plate VII B) and in the presbytery of Jedburgh Abbey, Roxburghshire (Plate VIII A). The precise form taken by the lower arches at Tewkesbury is not exactly demonstrable, except that the inner and lowest order adjoined the aisle. If this be set out on paper, it will be seen that any other recessed orders, concentric but necessarily of wider span, would only strike the cylindrical piers at or above the level of the 14th-century capital, and this may indeed have been the factor which decided at what point the later builders set their capitals. The accompanying diagram (Fig. 1) and plan (Fig. 2) shew a suggested arch of three orders, all on the inner face, which would provide the necessary thickness of wall, but which is a different and perhaps more tentative solution of the problem than those adopted in the later examples.


In considering these later examples, it should be borne in mind that until the advanced example at Oxford Cathedral is reached, the use of the cylindrical pier with the double storey is applied to a double-bay system and not to a continuous arcade.¹ Thus at Romsey the first free-standing pier on each side of the nave is so treated, while the east responds and the second and third pairs of piers are of the ordinary compound type with recessed orders, though even here between the compound piers the face of the main arches with that of the tribune above is set back by two orders from the main wall-surface and is enclosed under a main arch of two orders whose supports are carried down to the floor. The treatment of the aisle-vault is different on each side. On the north it springs off the same corbelling on the cylindrical pier from which the main arcade also springs. This arcade is of two

¹ This remark is further confirmed by the fact that the only known example of a similar design in France, i.e., the choir of St. Thomas Priory (now demolished) at Épernon, Eure-et-Loire, conformed also to the double-bay system. Information on this building can be found in an article by Adolphe de Dion, *L'église du Prieuré Saint-Thomas d'Épernon*, published in the *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Rom-*

bouillet, vol. xi, Tours, 1896, pp. 551-568. The priory of Épernon, formerly called 'La Trinité de Seincourt', was given to the Abbey of Marmoutier near Tours in 1052, but the choir was not built until some time after that date. From the character of the architecture and capitals, a date c. 1130 seems most likely. (Plate VIII A.)




A. JEDBURGH ABBEY : W. BAY OF
PRESBYTERY FROM S.



F. ST. THOMAS D'ÉPÉRON : ELEVATION AND
SECTION OF CHOIR ARCADE

The permission of the Cartland Institute of Art



A. ST. THOMAS D'ÉPERNON : PLAN AND LONGITUDINAL SECTION



B. DUNSTABLE PRIORY : NAVE FROM S.W.
(Plans : Summer)

orders towards the nave and three towards the aisle. The cylindrical pier on the south, on the other hand, has three attached shafts towards the aisle, from which the aisle-vault springs. This work can be assigned to about 1140. The work at Jedburgh Abbey is probably after 1150 and is not unsimilar to that at Romsey. It occupies the two west bays of the presbytery, and here the arches of the main arcade are of three shallow orders, all are stilted and spring from continuous corbelling carried round the rear part of the pier. The responds of the two bays have or had cylindrical piers of the same order. At both Romsey and Jedburgh the tribune-arches are the full width of the bay and are subdivided by subsidiary arches. At Jedburgh, furthermore, the same system was adopted in the single east arch in each arm of the transept.

The eastern parts of the cathedral at Oxford were built probably about 1170-80, the nave being somewhat later. Here the continuous system of cylindrical piers at Tewkesbury was reverted to, with certain modifications. Thus the main arcade is of a single plain order springing from corbelling on the rear part of the pier, and the open arches of the tribune are replaced by a much reduced opening of two small twin arches. The main arch above and enclosing them is of two orders, and the clearstory has a window-arch flanked by two subsidiary arches to the clearstory passage.

An example of the same principle applied with greater complexity is to be found in the nave at Dunstable Priory (Plate IXB). The main arcade here would appear to date from about 1150 and the tribune above is somewhat later. The colossal order still in part survives, and from it springs the outer order of the arches of the tribunes, but it is masked, in part, by a vaulting shaft and pilaster applied centrally to its nave-face, the shaft being itself carried up through the abacus of the capital of the colossal order. The two orders of the main arcade, furthermore, are supported on the shafts of the compound pier of which the divided half-cylinder of the colossal order forms only a part which appears on the face towards the nave.

Finally, towards the end of the century, in the transept at Glastonbury (built about 1186-96), though much ruined, the design is easily recoverable. The arches to the chapels and the corresponding arches, partly pierced for entry into the choir-aisles, are pointed and have above them a wall-arcade of three blind-arches in each bay. The whole is enclosed under the tall pointed arches of the major arcade, the shafted outer order of which is continued down to the floor-level.

TEWKESBURY ABBEY
RECONSTRUCTION OF LATE 11TH CENTURY CHOIR ARCADE




FIG. 1

TEWKESBURY ABBEY DETAILS OF PRESBYTERY AND NAVE ARCADES




FIG. 2

SOME MINOR IRISH CATHEDRALS

By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM

The remarkable character of the prehistoric and early Christian monuments of Ireland has probably been responsible for the almost complete neglect with which many large classes of later medieval Irish buildings have been treated. No general attempt has ever been made to examine the extraordinarily numerous churches and convents of the mendicant orders scattered over the country, and a book on the evolution of the Irish castle has only recently appeared. The type of structure, however, which has received least attention of all, is that of the Irish cathedrals. The two cathedrals (Christ Church and St. Patrick) in Dublin and that at Kilkenny are, of course, well known, though the mistaken opinion is still vaguely held in some quarters that the crypt at Christ Church is much earlier than its late 12th-century superstructure. In regard to the minor cathedrals, however, published information is largely lacking, unless the building incorporates some structure belonging to the earlier age of Irish Christianity.¹

In approaching the inquiry it must be accepted, at the outset, that the ordinary development of cathedral-building in England or on the Continent has little or no bearing on the form and structure of these Irish churches. Most of them are insignificant in size and their interest lies largely in their unfamiliar and highly individual forms.

These smaller cathedral-churches of Ireland fall naturally into four types of gradually increasing complexity, which incidentally agree to some extent with their chronological order. The simplest of these types is the single chamber building which is to be found in the group which dates generally from the 10th century. Clonmacnois Cathedral, though largely rebuilt at a later date, seems to represent in plan the church rebuilt in 910. To precisely the same type belongs the cathedral of Scatterry² (county Clare), of which the dimensions correspond very closely to those of Clonmacnois. Aghadoe Cathedral³ also is of this type, though actually a building of the 12th century. To these may be added in all probability the early cathedral churches of Ardmore,⁴ Kilmacduagh, and perhaps Glendalough,⁵ though all three have various later additions.

The second type displays the simple nave and chancel plan, a plan which is no doubt as old as the preceding, but its surviving examples in the cathedrals date mainly from the middle of the 12th century. This was the form of the early cathedral of Tuam (the nave has gone), of the enlarged cathedrals of Glendalough, Ardmore, and Clonfert, and perhaps of others.

¹ T. M. Fallow, *Cathedral Churches of Ireland* (1894), gives a general account of the surviving remains of the minor Irish cathedrals, but the book is in no sense an architectural or archaeological study.

² *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., vii (1897), 277.

³ *Ibid.*, 5th ser., ii (1892), 163.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 5th ser., xiii (1903), 365.

⁵ *Public Works Ireland Report*, 1911-12.

Thirdly comes the aisleless cruciform type, not earlier than the 13th century, of which the cathedrals of Cashel¹ and Killaloe² (Fig. 1) still survive largely intact, while that at Kildare has been partly rebuilt; all these have a central tower.




FIG. 1. KILLALOE CATHEDRAL

Lastly, the cruciform church with an aisled nave was first introduced at Limerick in the third quarter of the 12th century and repeated at Cloyne, Armagh,³ and Newtown Trim⁴ in the 13th century. Somewhat of the same type was the destroyed cathedral at Waterford in its 12th-century form and before its 13th-century and later extensions.⁵

CLONMACNOIS

Clonmacnois Cathedral⁶ (county Offaly) is probably the most generally known of all these minor cathedrals, owing to its early associations and the extent and importance of the other buildings on the site.

¹ *Ibid.*, 1907-08.

² T. J. Westropp, in *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., ii (1892), 410, iii (1893), 187.

³ *Ecclesiologist*, xvi, 8 (no plan).

⁴ *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxviii (1931), 364.

⁵ In the preparation of these notes I am greatly indebted to Mr. H. G. Leask for valuable assist-

ance and through him to the Commissioners of Public Works of Éire for the loan of the plan of Kilmacduagh Cathedral. I am furthermore indebted to Mr. Leask for his personal assistance in the survey of Leighlin Cathedral.

⁶ *Public Works Ireland Report*, 1906-07.

The church (Fig. 2) is a plain rectangle (62 ft. by 28½ ft.) and the presence of buttresses *in antis* at both ends of the building seems to imply that it has preserved its 10th-century plan, though most of the superstructure has been rebuilt. The west doorway is a work of the 12th century, but the main interest of the building lies in its late Gothic alterations. These consist of the elaborate north doorway inserted by Dean Odo about 1460 and the reconstruction of the choir, probably of the same date. This last work consisted of the insertion of a system of low vaulting, two bays deep and three in the width, and providing a second story or internal gallery at the east end of the church.




FIG. 2. CLONMACNOIS CATHEDRAL

This vaulted space had open arches toward the west, as is indicated by the surviving remains, but its purpose is highly problematical. One can only suggest that the new high altar occupied the middle of the raised gallery and that it may have been approached by a broad flight of steps in the middle bay of the new structure. This scheme would have certain features in common with the *pontile* in Italian churches, but why it was introduced into this remote and primitive Irish cathedral must remain a mystery.

CLONFERT

Clonfert Cathedral¹ (county Galway) is generally known only from its splendid Irish Romanesque west doorway. This feature entirely deserves its high reputation, and not its least interesting feature is the pronounced inward inclination of the jambs, derived from a far earlier tradition and highly remarkable in a structure of the middle of the 12th century. With the exception of the west wall the rest of the church (Fig. 3) seems to have been rebuilt on a nave and chancel plan early




FIG. 3. CLONFERT CATHEDRAL

in the 13th century. To this date belongs the interesting pair of lights in the east end. The transepts (one roofless and one destroyed), the chancel arch, and the west tower are late Gothic additions, perhaps resulting from the decayed state of the fabric referred to in the papal letters under 1414. The tower is an instance of the slender friars' towers, built on two walls running east and west within the west end of the nave, its position being very similar to the corresponding feature at Ross (county Cork).

¹ The best general account of the building (no plan) is in R. R. Brash, *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland* (1875), p. 41. For the

12th-century west doorway, see F. Henry, *La Sculpture irlandaise*, pl. 162.

TUAM

Tuam Cathedral¹ is little known save for its remarkable Romanesque chancel arch. As the see of the archdiocese of Connaught it is not a little surprising to find that the mid-12th-century church seems to have continued to do duty as the cathedral until late in the Middle Ages. This church (Fig. 4) was of the simple native Irish type consisting of




FIG. 4. TUAM CATHEDRAL

a square chancel (about 18 ft.) with a nave of proportionate size which has now entirely vanished. Till the building of the new cathedral in 1861-1863, this chancel formed the west porch of the church, the nave having been removed at some uncertain date, perhaps after the fire of 1787. The chancel arch is well known and forms one of the richest examples of Irish Romanesque. The central window of the three in the east wall at that time formed the inner doorway. The late medieval choir (71 ft. by 27 ft.) is at earliest of late 14th-century date and may be of the middle of the 15th century, as the papal registers record that the cathedral was in bad repair in 1441. The structure (Plate XB) survives, though the windows have been partly renewed. It has the heavy corbelled parapet, not infrequent in Irish churches of the period, and well-preserved piscina and sedilia. At the west end is a fine lofty pointed arch, the full width of the building, and set on this and the east wall of the early chancel was one of those slender friars' towers (Plate XA) to which we have already referred. It had been repaired (according to an inscription on the east face) in 1688, but survived until the building of the new cathedral, when it was wantonly destroyed. This is hardly the place to mention the elaborate Italian baroque stall work which now fills much of the building.

¹ No general account of this cathedral has been published. Notices of the 12th-century chancel and arch appear in most general publica-

tions on Irish architecture, and it is illustrated in F. Henry, *La Sculpture irlandaise*.



A. TUAM CATHEDRAL (1862)



B. TUAM CATHEDRAL : CHOIR FROM S.E.
Copyright: Harvard University Press

KILMACDUAGH

Kilmacduagh Cathedral¹ (county Galway) forms the most important structure (Fig. 5) of the group of churches which centre around it. The western part of the nave is a megalithic structure probably of the 10th century, and, without excavation, it is impossible to determine if this church was a simple rectangle or if it had a chancel which was removed in the 12th-century enlargement of the nave. The later medieval




FIG. 5. KILMACDUAGH CATHEDRAL

alterations to the church consist of the addition of transeptal chapels north and south of the nave and of a new chancel and sacristy. The chancel and south transept are probably works of the 15th century, but the north transept is certainly earlier. These transepts, forming adjuncts to the nave, are again a typical feature of Irish Gothic work; they occur in their most pronounced and fully developed form in the friars' churches, but until a more careful analysis has been made of the chronological

¹ *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., xiv (1904), 220.

evidence it is impossible to say if here again we are to recognize the strong influence of the mendicant orders on Irish Gothic. Transepts of a precisely similar nature were added to the cathedral of Clonfert, and a single one, on the scale of the friars' transepts, to the cathedral of Ardfert (Kerry). It is clear from the abstracts in the calendar of papal letters that from 1318 onward constant attempts were made to unite the Connaught sees of Kilmacduagh, Achonry, and Annaghdown to the primatial see of Tuam on the plea of poverty. The separate sees nevertheless survived, and it is not a little surprising to find the evidence of much late medieval architectural activity at Kilmacduagh in spite of the avowed poverty of the church.

ARDFERT

The cathedral of St. Brendan Ardfert¹ presents certain difficulties in interpretation, though the dates of the various parts are generally clear (Fig. 6). The west front incorporates a portion of the arcaded front of a




FIG. 6. ARDFERT CATHEDRAL

church which cannot be placed earlier than about 1150. The central doorway survives, and this and the external arcading have somewhat elaborate shafting which is unlikely to be earlier in the century. The

¹ A. Hill, *Ardfert Cathedral with drawings and plan* (Cork, 1879). See also H. Eltrington in

The Reliquary and Illust. Archaeologist, n.s. vii (1901), 217, with illustrations.

recesses of the arcading, furthermore, have remains of a masonry of square stones set diagonally. The external width of this front was about 28½ ft., but the northern end was not incorporated in the later building, which entirely ignores the axis of the earlier nave. The middle part of the north wall of the later church is built of large-stone masonry which differs from that of the 13th-century work elsewhere in the building. It would appear possible that this represents a rebuilding and prolongation of the north wall of the 12th-century chancel; if so, this chancel can have been only about 10 ft. wide internally, which may be compared with the width of only 6 ft. of the original chancel at Kilmalkedar (Kerry). In this case the rebuilt chancel was presumably widened towards the south. Alternatively this length of walling may have been the first step in the construction of the existing enlarged church, undertaken when the 12th-century nave was still standing and replacing the, no doubt, small square chancel of c. 1150. However this may be, the 13th century saw the laying out of a new nave and chancel, ignoring the east and west lines of the 12th-century nave; it extended east as far as and perhaps beyond the east side of the later transept, and had an aisle on the south with an arcade of three pointed arches. The roof-line of this aisle shews that it extended some 2 ft. east of the west respond of the later transept-arcade, and above the eastern arch of this same arcade are two 13th-century windows and traces of a third further west. Some intermediate stage between the setting out of the wider nave and the erection of the handsome existing 13th-century chancel seems demanded by the long and otherwise unexplained interval between the end of the south aisle and the work of the existing chancel. This chancel, which is similar to the fine contemporary work of the chancel at Cashel, must, one supposes, be not earlier than the middle of the 13th century (Plate XI A). The lancet-windows of the east and south walls have banded shafts, and the work is both refined and well executed. A pair of corbels in both walls shew that the chancel terminated towards the west in some form of timber screen or loft. The east wall retains its SE. clasping buttress with shafted angles and remains of the corresponding buttress at the NE. angle.

The later work of the cathedral includes the long projecting south transept of a type very familiar in the friars' churches in Ireland, and the small NE. chapel, or perhaps sacristy, which has one arch in the west wall formerly opening into a western annexe or chamber, now destroyed. Both these features probably date from the 15th century, as do certain additions within the west end of the church, one of which supported a staircase of unknown purpose. At the same period the whole of the side walls of the church were crowned with continuous stepped battlements, also a familiar Irish feature.

The whole church was left derelict after the wars of the 17th century, but the south transept was subsequently patched up and did duty as a church, though the see was united to Limerick in 1661. This transept is now again roofless.

Two slabs with effigies of bishops survive in the chancel ; one of the 13th century is now set upright in the south recess in the east wall ; the other lies on the floor and is of somewhat later date.

The former Round Tower is supposed to have stood some 35 to 50 ft. from the SW. angle of the cathedral. It fell in 1771, but some stones worked to an external curve have been collected and piled in that position within recent years.

There are two detached chapels¹ standing NW. of the cathedral and in the same churchyard. The eastern of these, Temple-na-hoe, is a work of the middle of the 12th century and the nave survives largely entire ; it is the subject of a short monograph by A. Hill. The western chapel is a structure of the later Middle Ages.

EMLY

The old cathedral at Emlý was pulled down in 1828 and a modern church built. This survived till after the disestablishment, when it too was demolished.²

The only record of the appearance of the old cathedral is a drawing³ by Thomas Dineley of the time of Charles II. This shews the main body of the church still roofed and having a large six-light and traceried east window and the east gable rising at the back of a horizontal stepped parapet. To the north of the church is a tower connected with the main building by a corridor. The roofless structures to the south of the church would appear to represent an extensive transept in the Irish manner with a central chapel (like that at Ardfer) projecting east from it and having a large east window.

KILDARE

The cathedral of St. Brigid Kildare stands in an enclosure to the NW. of the market place. To the north of the nave are the scanty remains of the Fire House and a little distance to the west is the Round Tower (Fig. 7). The early history of the site has been dealt with in numerous publications. The earliest building surviving is the Round-Tower,⁴ 105½ ft. high, and presumably a work of the 10th century with the conical top replaced by 15th-century battlements. The Fire House, a small square building, is now reduced to little more than foundations, probably of late medieval date ; the west wall was standing when drawn by Austin Cooper in 1784.

The cruciform 13th-century cathedral⁵ was begun, probably in 1229, by Bishop Ralph of Bristol ; it would appear to have been carried forward to completion within the next forty years. There is little to distinguish


¹ Plan shewing relative positions of group in *Journ. Hist. and Arch. Assn. of Ireland*, 4th ser. vi, 294.

² T. M. Fallow, *The Cathedral Churches of Ireland*, 51.


³ *Kilkenny Arch. Soc.*, 2nd ser. v, 285.

⁴ *Kildare Arch. Soc.*, i, 86.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ii, 235 and iii, 479 ; H. N. Craig, *The Cathedral of St. Brigid, Kildare*, 1946.



A. AEDFERT CATHEDRAL : INTERIOR OF CHANCEL
(Photo. J. Mason)



B. KILDARE CATHEDRAL AND ROUND TOWER
(Photo. H. G. Leach)



A. LEIGHLIN CATHEDRAL FROM S.E.
(A and C. Copyright, Harvard University Press)



B. LEIGHLIN CATHEDRAL FROM S.E.
(Photo, H. G. Lusk)



C. LEIGHLIN CATHEDRAL
FROM S.E.

the character and quality of the old work from full Anglo-Irish work of that age, except for the acutely gabled weathering of the roof of the destroyed chapel east of the south transept, which draws the steepness of its pitch from earlier originals. There seems to have been also a chapel east of the north transept represented by a fragment of foundation. The history of the structure for the rest of the Middle Ages is almost a blank; there is, however, in 1395 a papal relaxation¹ of penance to




FIG. 7. KILDARE CATHEDRAL

those visiting and giving alms for the conservation of the church which may indicate a date for the stepped battlements of the nave (Plate XIb). The cathedral certainly suffered severely in the 17th-century wars, though there seems little evidence that the steeple was beaten down by cannonade in 1641. It is thought more likely that the major part of the tower collapsed through faulty foundations and carried with it the north

¹ *Cal. Pap. Letters*, iv, 507.

transept and at least part of the chancel. After the Restoration a new chancel was built, probably in 1686, by Bishop William Moreton, with a chapter-room to the south of it. The rest of the church remained ruined and roofless until the general restoration was begun in 1875. The architect was G. E. Street, and he was succeeded by J. F. Fuller. The nave was reinstated with much of the west wall modern but otherwise substantially old; the south transept is also old with the southern arch and supports of the central tower; most of the rest of the tower is a reconstruction. The chancel was entirely rebuilt on the 13th-century foundations, and during the preliminary work in 1891 two graves were found in the core of the old south wall.

The south transept is of a very simple but effective form of 13th-century design with three graduated lancets in the south wall and two lancets on the west. The central tower has rectangular supports with attached shafts and ribbed pointed arches. The upper part is a restoration on the old lines. The chief feature of the nave is the series of pointed arches of the side-walls sprung between the buttresses and supporting the embattled parapet. The arches have a rib on the outward face, but against the face of the nave wall is a pierced slot like that for a portcullis, but less wide. The purpose of these slots is difficult to determine unless they are retained as a defensive convention; for practical defensive purposes they are nearly useless (Plate XIb). The general arrangement of these wall-arches is similar to those on the chancel at Tuam. One other point should be noted, the axis of the chancel is deflected appreciably to the north of that of the nave.

In the chancel is a well-preserved 13th-century effigy of a bishop,¹ and it may be noted that an effigy² of Bishop Walter Wellesley, 1539, is preserved at Great Connell Abbey not far away. Other memorials³ and carved work are kept in the south transept of the cathedral.

LEIGHLIN

Leighlin⁴ stands in the barony of Idrone West and the county of Carlow. The early monastery was founded by St. Laserian in the 7th century, presumably at Old Leighlin, a few miles west of Leighlin Bridge over the Barrow, where the cathedral now stands. A castle was built by the bridge by Hugh de Lacy c. 1181, and near here was later founded a Carmelite friary.

In 1248 there was a project⁵ to move the cathedral to 'a central safe and fit place in the diocese', presumably meaning the east side of the Barrow and within the Pale. This project was seemingly abandoned, and toward the close of the century a new cathedral (Fig. 8) was built. It consisted of the long chancel and nave of the present church

¹ *Kildare Arch. Soc.*, viii, 329.

² *Ibid.*, ii, 303.

³ *Ibid.*, iv, 379; v, 152; viii, 503.

⁴ There is no published account of this

cathedral except in Mr. Fallow's book and in incidental references. There is also no published survey or plan.

⁵ *Cal. of Papal Letters*, i, 242.

(Plate XIIA and c) to which very shortly afterwards the two transepts were added north and south of the nave. The northern one is now roofless and the southern one has been destroyed. They were entered by arches with shafted responds executed in granite. The shafted splays of the eastern windows of the chancel and the four-bay sedilia with trefoiled heads are good examples of late 13th-century work.

The wealth of the cathedral was increased¹ in 1432 by the annexation to it of the Augustinian Priory of St. Stephen, Leighlin, which had been vacant for forty years. This priory is not otherwise known.




FIG. 8. LEIGHLIN CATHEDRAL

The late Gothic alterations to the cathedral are ascribed to Bishop Mathew Sanders (1529-1549), whose tomb-slab with a cross and the indent of a brass figure lies in the chancel. The slab has an added inscription to Bishop Thomas Field, 1567. These late alterations include the insertion of the tower in the west end of the chancel, the addition of the large chapel on the north of the chancel and the partial rebuilding of the north and south walls of the chancel itself (Plate XII B). The tower is built on four arches set within the earlier walls, and has an elaborately ribbed vault, the plan of which is reproduced exactly as an ornamental design on the panels of a 16th-century altar-tomb in the nave. The windows in this late work have the usual flowing tracery of that age in Ireland.

¹ *Ibid.*, viii, 436.

The cathedral was thus, originally, of the simple nave and chancel type, to which were added the typical transeptal adjuncts to the nave and the equally typical tower of the friars' type.

Curiously enough the font of late 12th- or early 13th-century date is probably earlier than any surviving part of the building. It is square and supported on five shafts.

ROSS CARBERY

The cathedral of St. Faughan, Ross Carbery, is a cruciform building almost entirely rebuilt in the 19th century.¹ The tower, set within the west end of the nave, is probably of the 17th century with a 19th-century capping and spire. The east window is cased inside with a reset 13th-century arch and shafted jambs, partly restored. The north transept, which has a deeper projection than the south and diagonal buttresses at the corners, is probably medieval.

CORK

The medieval cathedral of St. Finbarr, Cork, survived until 1735 when it was demolished. A small classical building was then erected. This was, in turn, removed in 1864 to give place to the present cathedral designed by W. Burgess.²

Documentary evidence shews that the medieval cathedral was cruciform, but few details are known. The only remains preserved are a series of carved heads now in the vestry and some architectural fragments built into an ornamental doorway on the upper side of the churchyard. The series of heads is fine Irish Romanesque work of the 12th century, each carved on the end of a stone originally tailed into the wall. The architectural fragments are of two dates. The inner member of the door has a pointed and moulded arch of the 13th century, with jambs of the same section, but the imposts are of the 15th century. The outer member has 15th-century jambs and capitals and a septfoiled pointed arch and moulded enclosing order. There are also three head corbels, one a crowned king of the 13th century, and a number of other fragments set against the churchyard wall.

LIMERICK

Limerick³ belongs to the latest development of the minor Irish cathedral plan. It is a cruciform church (Fig. 9) with an aisleless choir and aisled nave, to which various chapels and a western tower were

¹ T. M. Fallow, *The Cathedral Churches of Ireland*, 68.

² T. M. Fallow, *The Cathedral Churches of Ireland*, 46.

³ T. J. Westropp, in *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., viii (1898), 112, gives a good

account of the building and indicates its Cistercian affinities, but the cross-arches of the aisles escaped his attention. Attention may perhaps be called to the series of late 15th-century carved misericords which appears to be English work.

subsequently added. Much of the structure dates from the second half of the 12th century, and its characteristics imply that it was put up before the English conquest. The heavy square piers of the nave, the absence of any provision for a central tower, and the curious cross-arches formerly dividing the bays of the aisles seem very strongly to imply that the general design was borrowed from the early Cistercian churches of the country¹ (a direct introduction from Burgundy), though it is doubtful if any of the surviving Cistercian churches of Ireland are of as early a date as the cathedral at Limerick. The arches across the aisles, of which most of the scalloped imposts still remain, were sprung from a level some feet below the capitals of the nave arcades, and it




FIG. 9. LIMERICK CATHEDRAL

seems probable that they represent the skeleton of the well-known early Cistercian and Burgundian system of roofing the aisles with a cross-vault in each bay. At Limerick, however, only the cross-arches were ever erected, and these must have supported a high stretch of plain 'diaphragm' walling under the timber roof. Traces yet survive of the high arch opening into the south transept, but there is no evidence that

¹ *Arch. Journal*, lxxxviii (1931), 1.

any arch existed on the west of the crossing. This was a common system in the earlier Irish Cistercian churches, where the high roof of the nave was continued east to the chancel arch. Only one of the later features of the cathedral need be touched upon; this is the inserted west tower built upon arches over the west bay of the nave. The tower is narrower than the nave itself and is thus an example of the type of tower almost universally employed in the churches of the Irish friaries. These towers, commonly additions to an earlier building, are constructed on two parallel walls with arches, carried across the building, from the middle of which rises a slender square tower much narrower in width than the building below. This type of structure seems to have been copied from English originals in the mendicant orders (examples still survive at Coventry, Lynn Regis, and Atherton) and was almost universal among the numerous Franciscan and Dominican churches of Ireland. Once well established in the latter country it was adopted here and there by other orders, as may be seen in the Austin Canons houses at Clare Abbey¹ (near Ennis), Killagha Abbey² (Kerry), Inistoge Priory³ (Kilkenny), and elsewhere. When added to the smaller secular cathedrals, this type of tower was more varied in its position and type, and the examples at Tuam, Clonfert, and Ross are highly individual.

WATERFORD

The medieval cathedral of Holy Trinity, Waterford, was demolished in 1773 and replaced by the present classical building. There is a description of the older cathedral in Dr. Charles Smith's account of the *Ancient and Present State of the County and City of Waterford*, published in 1774. A plan and drawings of the exterior in Sir James Ware's *History of the Bishops of Ireland* record the appearance in 1739,⁴ and a picture now hanging in Bishopsgrove, Waterford, shews the arrangement of the interior in its last days.⁵

The medieval cathedral was a complex building of several dates (Fig 10). The earliest part was the nave, an aisled structure of four bays with heavy square piers and round-headed arches. There is no record of the detail. The round-headed Romanesque south door can be seen in the drawing of 1739 (Plate XIII A) and one of the arches of the south arcade appears in the painting. The plan resembles that of the Romanesque Cathedral of Limerick, though the length of the nave and the span of the arches were on a smaller scale. The building was probably contemporary with Limerick, erected in the second half of the 12th century, and the east end of that date probably followed the same plan.

¹ *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., x (1900).

² *Ibid.*, 5th ser., xvi (1906).

³ *Ibid.*, 5th ser., vi (1896).

⁴ T. M. Fallow, *The Cathedral Churches of Ireland* (1894), 69; Dr. Smith's account of the medieval cathedral is quoted in full in this work.

⁵ We are greatly indebted to the Right Reverend Dr. J. A. Harvey, Bishop of Cashel, Waterford, Lismore and Emly, for permission to photograph and reproduce this painting, and to him and the Dean of Waterford, the Very Reverend N. H. Hamilton, for the courtesy and facilities afforded at Waterford.

WATERFORD CATHEDRAL




FIG. 10. WATERFORD CATHEDRAL.

Waterford received a new charter early in the 13th century, when the cathedral chapter was reorganized and its endowments increased. The building was then enlarged by the addition of an aisled choir stretching eastward as far as the ancient parish church of the Holy Trinity, which was also rebuilt in the 13th century. The work of this date can be seen in the 18th-century painting (Plate XIIIb). This shews the contemporary fittings of the choir, including box pews, an ornate bishop's throne, pulpit with sounding board, and turned altar rails. There are enriched screens in front of the two arcades and a third is visible one bay down the nave, enclosing the west end of the choir. The arcades have compound piers with vaulting shafts, and the main wall arches rise up to enclose the triforium. This arrangement occurs in a few English churches, of which the most notable was Glastonbury Abbey.¹ The adoption of this unusual design in Waterford in the early 13th century was doubtless due to the close connection between that city and Bristol, which was within the area of the West Country School of masons. The lines of the original stone vault are also shewn, but this had been replaced by a panelled wooden ceiling extending also over the nave.




FIG. 11. PIER IN WATERFORD CATHEDRAL

The date and character of the work shewn in the painting are borne out by the base of one of the piers of the south arcade, which can still be seen under the floor of the vestibule (Fig. 11; marked X on the plan). The compound order, the filleted shafts and the 'hold water' base are all characteristic of early 13th-century work.

¹In this connection it is worth quoting Clapham's description of Glastonbury from *English Romanesque Architecture after the Conquest* (p. 97): 'The most unusual feature of the church is the internal elevation of the bays; here the main arches and a triforium passage with three openings are both included under a lofty wall-arch designed to give the effect of being the main arcade, partly filled in with the actual arch and the triforium above. The same idea carried out in a much more Romanesque form is to be seen at Oxford Cathedral. Here the arches throughout are round, and the actual arcades are sprung from the faces of the cylindrical piers which are

carried up to support the wall-arches over the triforium. The date of this structure has been much disputed, but the character of its mouldings and decoration insist upon a period not earlier than 1170-80.' A footnote cites further instances from Romsey, Hants., and Jedburgh in Southern Scotland. For Glastonbury, begun after the fire of 1184, see A. E. Henderson, *Glastonbury Abbey, Then and Now*; Oxford, *Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, City of Oxford*, 37; Romsey, *Victoria County History, Hampshire*, iv, 464; Jedburgh, Macgibbon and Ross, *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland*, i, 398.



A. WATERFORD CATHEDRAL (1739)



D. WATERFORD CATHEDRAL (18TH CENTURY)



A. KILKENNY CATHEDRAL
(Photo: Mason)



B. KILKENNY CATHEDRAL
(Photo: Mason)

During the later Middle Ages chapels were added on both sides of the cathedral. The best recorded is that built about 1480 by James Rice, a wealthy citizen, who was several times Mayor of Waterford. This was richly adorned and contained the founder's tomb. The 18th-century engravings shew that the other chapels were also of late date with traceried windows. The panelled ceiling was set up in 1522 during the episcopate of Nicholas Comin (1519-51). The classical adornment of the choir was carried out in the time of Bishop Hugh Gore (1660-91).

KILKENNY

The cathedral of St. Canice, Kilkenny, lies to the north of the walled city, beyond the River Breach, on a slight hill in Irishtown. There was an earlier church on the site, and a well-preserved round tower still stands on the south side of the south transept. The See of Ossory, previously established at Aghadoe, was moved to Kilkenny early in the 13th century by Bishop Hugh Rufus, an English Augustinian, who had been Prior of Kells.¹

The cathedral is a cruciform building with two transeptal chapels on each side of the choir, a central tower and an aisled nave of five bays with a south porch (Fig. 12). The building was begun in the middle of the 13th century, probably by Bishop Hugh de Mapilton (1251-6), and completed by Bishop Geoffrey St. Leger (1260-86). The central tower fell in 1332 and was rebuilt in the 14th century.² The whole building was reroofed and restored in the 19th century (Plate XIVA). The cathedral retains much of the original detail, which is plain but of good quality with stiff-leaved foliage on the capitals. The main west door is of two bays with cinquefoiled heads; above are a large quatrefoil and two smaller ones below. The latter retain figures of attendant angels in relief, but the central sculpture has been destroyed. There are foliage rosettes in the spandrels and stiff-leaved capitals on the side shafts. The head stop on the north side of the hood remains, but it is replaced with a label on the south. The south porch is original; the outer door has stiff-leaved foliage and damaged heads on the capitals and two much weathered head stops to the hood. The inner door has stiff-leaved foliage and weathered head stops. The piers of the nave arcades are quatrefoiled with moulded bases and capitals and moulded arches (Plate XIVB). The windows of the clearstory are of quatrefoil shape with segmental rear-arches. The outer transeptal chapel on the south side, which breaks the symmetry of the plan, was entirely rebuilt

¹ J. Graves, *The History, Architecture and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of St. Canice, Kilkenny* (1857); *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxviii, 393; H. G. Leask in *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, lxxix, 1, who is of the opinion that the cathedral was begun before de Mapilton's episcopate.

² The NE. and SE. tower piers were almost entirely rebuilt in the 14th century, as was the east respond of the SW. pier. Only the NW. pier retains its original plan: square responds on all sides with attached shafts. H. G. L.




FIG. 12. KILKENNY CATHEDRAL.

(By courtesy of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland)



KILKENNY CATHEDRAL : TOMB IN NORTH TRANSEPT
[Photo: D. G. Lusk]



A. CLOYNE CATHEDRAL : SOUTH TRANSEPT



B. CLOYNE CATHEDRAL : EAST WALL OF SOUTH TRANSEPT
(Photo: H. G. Lusk)

in 1866. It was originally designed as a Lady Chapel and was rather later than the rest of the fabric. There are original hoods with head stops above the arches into the transeptal chapels. In the north wall of the north transept is a contemporary tomb of very good quality; the capitals have stiff-leaved foliage and there are head stops to the hood¹ (Plate XV).

CLOYNE

The cathedral of St. Colman, Cloyne, stands in an extensive churchyard with the remains of the 'firehouse', a nearly levelled early oratory, in the north-east corner. West of the cathedral and beyond the road is the round tower which was repaired in 1683 and adapted to serve as a belfry.²

The cathedral is a cruciform building of the 13th century with an aisled nave of five bays and a chapter house, parallel with the transept, on the north side of the chancel (Fig. 13). After an abortive attempt in




FIG. 13. CLOYNE CATHEDRAL

¹ In conversation Clapham suggested that this was the tomb of the builder Bishop Hugh de Mapilton (1251-6), but this is not recorded in his notes.

² *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser., vii (1897), 334 (T. J. Westropp); T. M. Fallow, *Cathedral Churches of Ireland*, 42.

the 14th century the see was united with Cork in 1431. From 1678 till the death of Bishop Brinkley in 1835 Cloyne was again a separate see, but in the latter year it was united with Cork and Ross Carbery. The nave arcades have plain pointed arches rising from rectangular, chamfered piers,¹ now cement rendered. The west doorway is of the 13th century much restored; the added 18th-century doorcase has Ionic columns and cherub's heads.² The aisles have been rebuilt, but restored lancets in the west walls, now out of centre, indicate an original width of 6 ft.³ The eastern bay of the nave is now incorporated in the chancel, the whole being walled off to form the parish church. The original arches into the transepts remain, blocked with screen walls, but the eastern arch into the chancel was removed in 1774. As at Limerick, the building followed the Irish Cistercian system with no western arch to the crossing. The south transept has three contiguous windows in the east wall; the central opening has three graduated trefoiled lights, and the others two (Plate XVII B). The rear-arches are shafted with foliage. The blocked south window was of five trefoiled lights with similar detail⁴ (Plate XVI A). The windows in the north transept are restored; the arrangement is original, with three lofty lancets in the end wall and a single window with three trefoiled lights to the east. The chancel is modernized. The 15th-century window of five lights with reticulated tracery was restored in 1856. Externally the transepts retain the original slight clasping buttresses, but the east end with its diagonal buttresses is late medieval. The Chapter House is probably of the 13th century with a 15th-century window in the north wall.

FERNS

A church⁵ was built on this site for St. Aidan or Maidoc in or about 598 by Brandub, King of Leinster, which subsequently became the see of the local bishop, and it was the accepted burial-place of the Kings of Leinster. It was plundered six times by the Danes and Dermot MacMurrough, the last King of Leinster, died here in 1171. The chancel of the cathedral and probably other parts seem to have been built by John St. John, the first Anglo-Norman bishop, 1223-43. After the Reformation the cathedral⁶ was burnt by the O'Byrnes about 1577, and Hooker about 1589 states that 'Fernes is the see and cathedral church of the bishop and was sometime a church well-adorned and maintained,

¹ Westropp (*op. cit.*, 335) states that the arcades are 'plaistered and whitewashed, thus concealing, I was told, capitals ornamented with foliage, of which no trace is now apparent'.

² This doorcase and other work of this date should be associated with the statement in the will of Bishop Charles Crow (1702-26), that he had spent over £2,000 on the cathedral (Sir James Ware, *History of the Bishops of Ireland*, 581).

³ The restored wall of the south aisle with

raking buttresses and oval windows is shewn in the engraving published in 1739 (Sir James Ware, *History of the Bishops of the Kingdom of Ireland*) and is clearly part of the work attributed to Bishop Crow.

⁴ The window is shewn in the engraving of 1739 published by Ware.

⁵ 78th Rep. Commissioners of Public Works (1910), 11; drawings and details pp. 54, 55.

⁶ H. Hore, 'Fernes, Co. Wexford' in *Journ. R. Soc. Ants. Ireland*, 5th ser. xx, 311-2.



Al. del. 18. Aug. 1786

Engr. 18. Aug. 1786

A. FERNS CATHEDRAL FROM S.E. (1786)



B. FERNS CATHEDRAL: NORTH WALL OF
EASTERN BUILDING
(Photo: Alton)

but now in great ruins and decay, the bishop and chapter not remaining there at all'. The chancel and tower were patched up and served as the cathedral and parish church, but it was extensively rebuilt in 1817.¹

The form of the building before the restoration of 1817 is preserved in a drawing by A. Cooper of 11th June, 1786² (Plate XVIIA), and in a plan of about the same age preserved in the archives of the Board of Works of Eire. These two make it perfectly clear that the cathedral then consisted of most of the body of the existing church with a tower occupying a site covering the existing tower and the west end of the existing church, that this tower was the same width as the existing church, that it had a blocked tower-arch in both the north and south walls, and that there remained walls with smaller arches extending north and south from the tower and presumably representing the former transepts. Furthermore, the existing building provides convincing evidence that the east end and the responds in the side-walls are 13th-century work surviving *in situ*, a fact which is further supported by the Cooper drawing of the east end with its windows and by a note on the plan. The acceptance of these facts, which seems unescapable, shows that the present cathedral represents the chancel of the medieval building, and that the aisled nave must have extended west far into the churchyard and has been destroyed without leaving a trace (Fig. 14). The restitution of this lay-out would produce a cathedral similar, both in date and in its main lines, to that of the still existing cathedral at Kilkenny.

The one grave difficulty to this reconstruction is obviously the existence of the ruined building, also of the 13th century, some 75 ft. east of the present church. That this can never have been the chancel of the cathedral as has been hitherto assumed is proved by the fact that its floor-level must always have been some 4 ft. or more below that of the existing church as indicated by the surviving respond-bases. We are thus forced to the conclusion that it must have been a separate structure, as its distance from the main church is too great for it to have been part of a series of chapels directly connected with it, such as was once to be seen in the old cathedral of Waterford.

What purpose this separate building may once have served is very difficult of solution. That it had anything to do with the Augustinian Abbey which stands a short distance to the south is rendered improbable from the fact that it is built axial with the cathedral. That it was an imposing chapel built to enclose the tomb of the founder St. Maidoc is difficult, as this would be more an Irish than an English practice at a time when English power was strong; but this would not necessarily rule it out. A more probable solution is that this was the medieval parish church, though one would have expected to find the parish altar in the nave of the cathedral.

¹ T. M. Fallow, *The Cathedral Churches of Ireland*, 23.

² L. Price, Editor, *An 18th Century Antiquary*

(Austin Cooper). Privately published: Falconer, Dublin, 1942, pl. 32.

FERN'S CATHEDRAL

Co. WEXFORD




FIG. 14. FERN'S CATHEDRAL.

The cathedral as it now stands is a rectangular building of which the east end and the arcade-responds are of the period of Bishop St. John, 1223-43. Beneath the chancel are two ranges of rubble vaults both apparently ancient and extending some 24 ft. from east to west. There were entrances immediately east of the arcade-responds and the lower jambs of the north doorway are old. The splayed buttresses of the east wall are all partly of the 13th century as are the three east windows. These have double-banded shafts to the splays and moulded caps and bases. The existing filling of the central window dates from the restoration of 1817. Higher up in the wall are two vesica-shaped windows of the 13th century with the reveals splayed downwards at the top and bottom. These features are shown in Cooper's drawing much as they exist now except for the filling of the central window. In the side walls are pairs of lancets and an internal wall-arcade all of 1817, but representing similar features of the 13th century. The piscina recess in the south wall is modern, but both the drains are old. The chancel-arch is a 19th-century addition. In both the side-walls, further west, are the east and west responds of former 13th-century arcades, opening into the side aisles of the presbytery. The blocking-wall between them on the north side is built upon three rough foundation-arches which indicate that the former arcade was of three bays, though the piers themselves have been removed. Part of the relieving arch of the north-west arch of the arcade can also be seen on the outside face and indicates the same spacing of the bays. The eastern responds are 11½ ft. high, including the bases and capitals carved with stiff-leaf foliage. The western responds are similar but with simple moulded capitals. In the south-west angle of the church is a tapering slab with the recumbent effigy of a bishop under a trefoiled and gabled canopy with censing angels. It seems likely that this represents Bishop St. John, died 1243, rather than the founder St. Maidoc; it is, at any rate, a work of the 13th century.¹

The rest of the existing building, entirely of about 1817, is shewn on the plan; this includes the Tower and Chapter Room. The plan also shews the lines of the older central tower, the transepts and the nave, the tower and transepts being based on the 18th-century plan of the Board of Works.

The ruined building, 75 ft. to the east of the cathedral, is likewise a structure of the first half of the 13th century (Plate XVIIb). The east wall has fallen, but the side-walls have or had each a range of seven lancet-windows, most of them largely complete. The internal splays meet with an attached shaft with caps, bands and bases.

At the west end of the south wall are the lower stones of a relieving arch showing that here (and no doubt also on the north) an arch sprang westwards. There is, however, no indication how far to the west the building extended.

¹ See *The Builder* ii (1844), 361.

THREE BEDE-ROLLS

By SIR ALFRED CLAPHAM

The custom of dispatching obituary bede-rolls or *rouleaux des morts* after the death of an ecclesiastic, or occasionally of some lay person of distinction, was both common and wide-spread in the Middle Ages. The roll was carried from the parent monastery to a long series of other monasteries or ecclesiastical establishments with a request for prayers for the soul of the deceased. It was usual, at any rate in the earlier rolls, for the recipients to add requests for prayers for the souls of various defunct members or benefactors of their own house, and sometimes to add Latin verses composed by individual members of that house.¹ Each entry is called a 'Titulus' and the number of these entries varies greatly, sometimes running to 600 and more.

The surviving English bede-rolls have been dealt with most fully by the late Sir William Hope in his communication on the Obituary Roll of John Islip, Abbot of Westminster, 1532, in *Vetust. Monument.* vii, Part IV (1906). Here he collects the then known English examples and illustrates headings from the rolls of Lucy, Prioress of Hedingham, in Essex, *circa* 1230,² and of John Wigenhale, Abbot of West Dereham, in Norfolk, 1455, besides the main subject of his communication.³ It may be noted here that the Islip Roll, borrowed by the Society of Antiquaries in 1791, was, in 1907, returned to Westminster Abbey.

The subject of the present notes is three continental bede-rolls, containing more or less numerous *Tituli* contributed by English houses. These, though they have long been in print, do not seem to have been used at all consistently by recent compilers of the details of English ecclesiastical or monastic history. All three contain *Tituli*, often with the names of deceased or living members of the houses concerned, and present three main features of interest:—(a) the precise title, at the date of the roll, of the ecclesiastical foundation subscribing the *Titulus*; (b) the names of defunct heads and other officers of the house which may or may not be elsewhere preserved; and (c) a corpus of names of inmates all of which must have been in use in the 11th century if not earlier, the rolls being respectively of the years 1101, 1113 and 1122. They further contain numerous Latin verses; these, however, will only be referred to in the present context. For the three reasons cited above it has been thought desirable to abstract from these three documents the material relating to England, in that two of the bede-rolls are otherwise only available, in print, in a not easily accessible volume: *Rouleaux des Morts du IX^e au XV^e siècle*, by L. Delisle. (Société de l'Histoire de France,⁴ Paris, 1866.)

¹ David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 501.

² *New Palaeographical Soc.* i (1903).

³ *cf. Society of Antiquaries Proceedings*, 2nd Series i (1869-71), 289, 290.

⁴ *cf. L. Delisle, 'Des Monuments Paléographiques concernant l'usage de prier pour les morts' (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, Second Series, Vol. iii (1846), 361-411.*

The bede-rolls here abstracted are those of (a) Bruno, founder of the Carthusian Order, 1101; (b) Matilda, daughter of William the Conqueror and abbess of La Trinité at Caen, 1113, and (c) Vitalis, first abbot of Savigny, 1122. (a) Bruno died at the Chartreuse of the Tower in Calabria in 1101, and his roll, then extant, was printed, though not completely, in the Life of the Saint published in Bâle about 1515; in this recension the names of the dead cited under each Titulus have been systematically cut down. A more readily accessible, though incomplete, version was printed by the Bollandists in *Acta Sanctorum*, October, iii, p. 736, and also, in more complete form, by F. A. Lefebure, *S. Bruno et l'Ordre des Chartreux* ii (Paris, 1883), p. 427.

The English entries are as follows :—

(a) The Roll of Bruno, founder of the Carthusian Order.

From *Acta Sanctorum*, October, Vol. iii.

p. 754. S. Pauli Apost. Lundeniensis. 'Decessumque sui Missis celebrare quotannis. Archidiaconi Rengerius, Walterus, Quintilianus, Robertus, Durandusque scholasticus, Theobaldus, Arturus, ceterique omnes canonici ecclesiae sancti Pauli Lundeniensis salutamus fraternaue dilectione impertimus eremitas ecclesiae sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae Turris Calabriae, concedimusque, ut petiistis, anniversarium fieri singulis annis reverendo magistro domino Brumoni servo Dei cunctisque fratribus coenobii vestri pridie Nonas Octobris; id concessimus publico consensu fratrum nostrorum, nomenque ejus nominibus fratrum nostrorum ascripsimus in memoriam praedictae commemorationis.'

p. 754. S. Mariae Connatensis in Anglia (suggests Coventry) (no names).

p. 756. SS. Petri et Augustini Anglorum Apostoli.
S. Edmundi regis martyr.
S. Mariae Spalingae ecclesiae S. Nicolai Andegavensis.
'Religiosis fratribus in loco, qui Turris appellatur, Deo devote famulantibus Lambertus abbas et tota congregatio sancti Nicolai salutem et dilectionem.'
S. Mariae ecclesiae Lincolnensis.
S. Mariae Eboracensis.
S. Petri Eboracensis Angliae metropolis.
S. Joannis archiepiscopi Beverlacensis ecclesiae. Verses by Canons of Beverley :—Richard, Albert, Turstan, Richard and William.
S. Petri Castrensis ecclesiae.
S. Mariae et S. Adelmi Malmesbenensis ecclesiae.

From F. A. Lefebure, *Saint Bruno et l'Ordre des Chartreux*, ii, p. 427
—Rouleau de Mort of Bruno. 177 Tituli.

155. S. Petri et S. Augustini anglorum apostoli.
156. S. Pauli Londoniensis. 'Archidiaconi Rangerius, Walterius' Quintilianus, Robertus Durandusque Scholasticus, Theobaldus, Arturus, caeterique omnes Canonici Ecclesiae S. Pauli Londoniensis, salutamus.'
157. 'Titulus discipuli ejus Rangerii. Ego Rangerius Viri Venerabilis Brunonis quamdam discipulus' . . .
158. S. Mariae Ecclesiae Lincolnensis (verses).
159. S. Mariae Spaldingae Ecclesiae S. Nicolai Andegavensis (verses).
160. S. Mariae sanctique Adelmi epis. et conf. Malmesbenensis Ecclesiae (verses).

161. S. Mariae Coventrensis Ecclesiae (verse).
 162. S. Edmundi (? recte Ethelredi) regis et martyris (ex Episcopatu Herefordiensi) (verse).
 163. Another of same.
 164. S. Petri Eboracensis Ecclesiae (verse).
 165. Another of same.
 166. B. Mariae Eboracensis.
 167. Another of same.
 168. S. Joannis Beverlacensis ecclesiae.
 169. Canonicorum S.J.B. coenobii Ricardus ad eundem.
 170. Albertus ..
 171. Turstanus ..
 172. Ricardus ..
 173. Willhelmus ..

(b) The Roll of Matilda, abbess of Caen, 1113, was preserved in the abbey of La Trinité, Caen, and was destroyed at the Revolution. A transcript had, however, been made for Mabillon, who published the encyclical and some of the Tituli. The full text is in Delisle's book, pp. 177-279.

The English entries are as follows :—

- p. 177. Matilda, d. of William the Conqueror, Abbess of La Trinité, Caen+1113.

[*Cathedral Monastery of St. Peter and St. Swithun, Winchester*]

- p. 186. '9. Titulus sancti Petri et sancti Swithuni Wintoniensis ecclesiae . . .
 Orate pro nostris defunctis : Athulfo, Ethelstano et Chnuto, regibus ; Imma regina, Alwino et Walchenino, episcopis ; Simeone abbate, et Godefrido priore, Hardingo, Gilleberto, Richardo, Tezo, Simon, et pro omnibus aliis.'

[*New Minster Abbey of St. Peter and St. Grimbald, Winchester*]¹

- '10. T. sancti Petri et sancti Grimbaldi Wintonienis ecclesiae . . . Orate pro nostris, Riwallone abbate, Rodberto abbate, Godwino priore, Sawino priore, Sawardo monacho, Sueartlingo monacho, Alfrico monacho, Wulmaro monacho, Alnotho monacho, Sinotho monacho, Alwino, Wulwardo, Randulfo, Sawardo, Alwino, Rannulfo, Agelwardo, Rogerio, Beorh, et ceteris omnibus.'

[*Abbey of St. Mary and St. Eadburg, Winchester*]

- p. 187. 11. T. gloriosae Dei genitricis Mariae et sanctae Eadburgae virginis Wintoniensis ecclesiae. (Latin verses.) 'Orate pro nostris Alvena abbatissa, Beatrice abbatissa, Mathilde priore, Emma priore. Godesteva monacha, Oswena monacha, Formosa monacha, Albreda monacha, Ulberga monacha, Alditha monacha, Wivida monacha, Bristeva monacha, Leveva monacha, Ediva monacha, Lewena monacha, Cecilia monacha, Ascelina monacha, Orengia monacha, Alveva monacha, Ascelina monacha, Gisla monacha, Lescelina monacha, Dina monacha, Ulburge monacha, Mathilde monacha, Mathilde, Benedicta monacha, Susanna laica ceterisque amicis nostris.'

¹ Removed to Hyde, 1111.

[*Abbey of St. Cross and St. Peter, Werwell*]

- p. 188. *12. T. sancte Crucis et sancti Petri Werwellensis ecclesiae. . . . Orate pro nostris, Acilstrita abbatissa, Mathilde abbatissa, Albereda abbatissa, Goditha monacha, Alveva monacha, Godiva monacha, Aldita monacha, Albereda monacha, Wlfruna monacha, ceterisque amicis nostris.

[*Abbey of St. Mary and St. Melor, Amesbury*]

*13. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Melorii Ambesbiensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse.) . . . Berengarius laicus, Biatrix femina, Annes monacha. Orate pro nostris, Hehahfleda abbatissa, Rachenilda abbatissa, Leveva monacha, Eva monacha, Margarita monacha, Ethveva monacha, Tiburga monacha, Tola monacha, Odelina monacha, Ascelina monacha, Rotberto, Albereda, Rotberto, Wilermo, Osmundo, Edita, Elwardo, Hugo, Alestano, Rotberto, Gildeberto, Philippo Pigot, Mathilde, Rotberto, Wascelino, Wilermo, Nigello, Christina, Adela, Hugo, ceterisque amicis nostris.

[*St. Mary, Salisbury*]

- p. 189. 14. T. sancte Mariae Seri[s] beriensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Edith, Wilton*]

15. T. sanctae Mariae et sanctae Edgithae Wiltoniensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Pancras, Lewes*]

16. T. sancti Pancratii martyris. (No names.)
17. T. Guitoniensis scolae.¹ (Latin verse. No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Edvard, Shaftesbury*]

- p. 190. *18. T. sancte Mariae et sancti Edvardi Sceptoniensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Eulalia abbatissa, Agnete priorissa, Rotza, Alberida, Adiliza, Cecilia, Susanna, Aluvena, Aileva, Ediva, Savia, Eldeva, Editha, Ediva, Benigna, Adelaisa, et aliarum. (Latin verse.)

[*St. Mary and St. Samson, Milton*]

*19. T. sanctae Marie et sancti Sansonis ecclesiae Milentonensis. . . . Orate pro defunctis nostris: Athelstano rege, Agelwardo comite, Edredo abbate, Eadwardo abbate, Alfrico abbate, Aldwino abbate, Bodrico monacho, Wlnotho monacho, Agelmaro monacho, Ednotho monacho, Wlfrido monacho, Alfrico monacho, Wlgeato monacho, Guthmundo monacho, Agelgaro monacho, Wlfrico monacho, Hradgaro monacho, Agelberto monacho, Algaro monacho, Agelwardo monacho, Alfrico monacho, et aliorum.

[*St. Mary and St. Peter, Exeter*]

- p. 191. 20. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Petri apostoli Exoniensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse. No names.)

[*St. Mary, Burton-on-Trent*]

21. T. sanctae Mariae Bertoniensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

¹ Identified by Delisle with Winchester, p. 512.

[*Holy Trinity, Lenton, Nottingham*]

22. T. sancte Trinitatis Novi Monasterii de Notigehan. (No names.)

[*St. Nicholas, Exeter*]

23. T. sancti Nicholai Exoniensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse. No names.)

[*St. Peter, Montacute*]

24. T. sancti Petri de Monte acuto. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, Muchelney*]

- p. 192. 25. T. sancti Petri Mycelaniensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Glastonbury*]

26. T. sanctae Mariae Glastoniae. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, Bath*]

27. T. sancti Petri Bathoniensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*Scholars of Bath*]

28. Vox scolarium ejusdem urbis. (Latin verse. No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Aldhelm, Malmesbury*]

- p. 193. 29. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Aldehmi confessoris Malmesberiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Tewkesbury*]

30. T. sanctae Mariae Teokesberiensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris : Giraldo abbate, Turstano, Mauro, Edmundo.

[*St. Mary and St. Kenelm, Winchcombe*]

31. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Kenelmi Wincelcumbensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris defunctis, Balduino, Petro et ceteris omnibus.

[*St. Mary and St. Egwin, Evesham*]

32. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Egwini Eoveshammii coenobii. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris, Alepcardo episcopo atque abbate, Mannio abbate, Agelwio abbate, Walterio abbate ; Ordmero, Collingo, Petro, monachis, et ceteris omnibus.

[*St. Mary, Pershore*]

33. T. sanctae Mariae Persorensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse. No names.)

[*Holy Trinity, York*]

- p. 194. 34. T. sanctae Trinitatis Eboracensis. Orate pro nostris Fulberto abbate, Aelfrido c [omite], Eadmundo c [omite], Turstino, Hugone abbatibus, Sewardi priore, Osberno, et ceteris omnibus.

[*St. Mary and St. Michael, Malvern*]

35. T. sanctae Mariae sanctique Michaelis Malvernensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Philippo, Benedicto, Augustino, et ceteris omnibus.

[*Holy Trinity and St. Mary, Coventry*]

36. T. sanctae Trinitatis et sanctae Mariae Ccvetrensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Tutbury*]

37. T. sanctae Mariae Totebeiae. Orate pro nostris Henrico monacho, Berta, Engenulfo, Willelmo monacho, Hildeberto, Nicholao, Rotberto, Alflet, Amicia, Adeleldis, Radulfo.

[*St. Mary, Blyth*]

38. T. sanctae Mariae Blidae. Orate pro nostris, Rogerio fundatore cenobii hujus, Odone monacho, Stephano monacho, Tethardo monacho, Rogerio monacho, Radulfo monacho, Benigno monacho, Ansfrido monacho, Willelmo monacho, Johanne monacho, Viviano monacho, Columbano et ceteris omnibus quorum nomina Deus scit.

[*St. Germans, Selby*]

p. 195. 39. T. sancti Germani Salisbiensis coenobii. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris, pro abbate videlicet Benedicto ecclesiae nostrae primo fundatore, et pro ceteris quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro viventium.

[*Holy Trinity, Norwich*]

40. T. sanctae Trinitatis Norwicensis ecclesiae. Versus Othonis juvenis.

[*St. Mary, York*]

p. 196. 41. T. sancte Mariae Eboracensis. Versus Benedicti (follows) Versus Ricardi. Versus Petri. Scilicet domno Stephano, primo ecclesiae nostrae abbate et fundatori, Rainfrido priori, Hildeberto priori, Raimundo monacho, Rogero monacho, Farmano monacho, Haymerico monacho, Thoro monacho, Willelmo monacho, Turchillo monacho, Brandoni monacho, Algaro monacho, Liwino monacho, Berengario monacho, Colemanno monacho, Godefrido monacho, Erengirino monacho, Petro monacho, Osberto monacho, Roscelino monacho, Alano comiti, ecclesiae nostrae benefactori; Rotberto monacho, Sirico monacho, David monacho, Waltero monacho, Willelmo monacho, Radulfo monacho, Hadwino monacho, Rumfaro monacho, Willelmo monacho, Laurentio monacho, Girardo monacho, Osberto monacho, Godefrido monacho, Sumberlet monacho, Hugoni monacho, et ceteris amicis nostris quorum nomina scriban [ur] in libro vitae. Amen.

[*St. Peter, York*]¹

42. T. sancti Petri Eboracensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris, Aldredo archiepiscopo, Thoma archiepiscopo, Girardo archiepiscopo, Girardo archidiacono, Dinando archidiacono, Rannulfo archidiacono et thesaurario, Aldredo canonico, Saxfordo canonico, Giraldo canonico, Willelmo archidiacono, Alvero canonico.

[*St. Mary, Lincoln*]

p. 200. 43. T. sanctae Mariae Lincoliensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse. No names.)

¹ The names of the archdeacons of York are included in C. T. Clay's paper in *Journ. Yorks. Arch. Soc.*, xxvi, 274-5. The York Titulus (from Matilda's Roll) was made before February, 1114.

[*St. Bartholomew and St. Guthlac, Crowland*]

44. T. sancti Bartholomei et sancti Guthlaci Crulandiae. Orate pro nostris, Thurkytelo abbate, Oskytelo abbate, Ulskytelo abbate, Godrico abbate, Algerico abbate, Ingulfo abbate, Wilgeto abbate, Suivato priore, Afgaro priore, Feggo monacho, Leofwino monacho, Bristano monacho, Askylo monacho, Thurgislo monacho, Triggo monacho, Ulfo monacho.

[*St. Mary and St. Nicholas, Spalding*]

45. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Nicholai Spallingensis ecclesiae. Hildini abbati, Hamoni abbati, Natali abbati, Arraldo abbati, et caeteris nostris congregationis professis [Abbots of S. Nicholas d'Angers].

[*St. Benet's of Holme*]

p. 201. 46. T. sancti Benedicti Holmensis ecclesiae. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris Alpwodo abbate, et ceteris omnibus quorum scit Deus nomina.

[*St. Benedict, Ramsey*]

47. T. sancti Benedicti Ramesiae. (Latin verse.) Ailwino comiti; Aetherico, Alfwardo, Eadnodo, episcopis; Athestano, Alfwino, Ailsino, Aldwino, abbatibus; Turberno priori, Turberno monacho, Vincentio monacho, Alfzio monacho, Radulfo monacho, Willelmo monacho, Alfredo monacho, Almaro monacho et ceteris.

[*St. Mary, Huntingdon*]

p. 202. 48. T. sanctae Mariae Huntendoniae. Orate pro nostris Ingelrammo canonico, et ceteris omnibus quorum scit Deus nomina.

[*St. Albans*]

49. T. sancti Albani prothomartyris Anglorum. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris Leofstano abbate, Freoderico abbate, Paulo abbate, Hermannio monacho, Rodberto monacho, Willelmo, Benedicto, Herfrido, Jacobo, Radulfo, Audeno, Hugone, Hunfrido, Rogero et pro ceteris omnibus quorum scit Deus nomina.

50. T. sancti Petri Westmonasterii. (Latin verse.) Eadwardo rege, Edgida regina, Vitali abbate, Roberto abbate, Nicholao, Egelwardo, Willelmo, ceterisque fratribus nostris.

[*St. Paul, London*]

p. 203. 51. T. sancti Pauli. (No names.)

[*St. Saviour, Bermondsey*]

52. T. sancti Salvatoris de Bermundesia. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Southwark*]

53. T. sanctae Mariae Sudhwerkensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Andrew, Rochester*]

54. T. sancti Andreae apostoli Rovecestrensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris Gundulfo episcopo, Siwardo, Arnosto, episcopis; Arnulfo priore et ceteris defunctis nostris.

[*St. Mary, Malling*]

55. T. sanctae Mariae Mellings ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris Gundulfo episcopo; Albereda, Belesend, Emma, Gerlendis, Ermensendia, Mathelda, Asa et ceteris defunctis nostris.

[*Christchurch, Canterbury*]

56. T. ecclesiae Christi Cantuariæ. (No names.)

[*St. Peter and St. Augustine, Canterbury*]

57. T. ecclesiae sancti Petri et sancti Augustini Anglorum apostoli. (No names.)

[*St. Martin, Battle*]

58. T. sancti Martini de Bello. (No names.)

(c) The Roll of Vitalis, abbot of Savigny, 1122, is still extant. It was found in the archives of the sous-préfecture of Mortain in 1835, was transferred to Paris in 1839, and is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. It is printed in Delisle, pp. 281-344, and the same author has published a separate study of the same Roll with facsimile reproductions. (Paris, 1909.)

The English entries are as follows :—

[*St. Peter, Gloucester*]

p. 312. 83. Titulus sancti Petri de Glocestra. (Latin verse.) Orate pro nostris defunctis, Serlone, Petro, abbatibus; Walterio priore; Bernardo, Mathia, Johanne, et caeteris omnibus.

[*St. Mary, Tewkesbury*]

84. T. sanctae Mariae de Teokesberia. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Evesham*]

85. T. sanctae Mariae Eveshamensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Pershore*]

p. 313. 86. T. sanctae Mariae de Persora. Orate pro nostris defun[c]ti scilicet Eadmundo, Turstino, Hugone, abbatibus; Odone comite, Sewarda priore, Ordgaro, Leowio, Osberno, Wilhelmo, Benigno, Ricardo, et pro aliis omnibus quorum anime requiescant in pace.

[*St. Mary, Worcester*]

87. T. sanctae Mariae Wigornensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, pro domno Vulstano et Samsone, episcopis; pro domno Thoma priore, pro Florentio et Henrico, Agelrico, Mauro, Symeone monachis et omnibus aliis.

[*Holy Trinity and St. Mary, Coventry*]

88. T. sancte Trinitatis et sanctae Marie Covantrensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Leovrico comite, Godiva comitissa, Leofwino, Rodberto, episcopis, Bruningo priore, Goduino, Patricio, Thoma, monachis et pro aliis nostris defunctis.

[*St. Mary, Burton-on-Trent*]

- p. 314. 89. T. sanctae Mariae Bertonensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris defunctis Nigello abbate, Edrico priore, Clemente monacho, et pro aliis omnibus.

[*St. Mary, Tutbury*]

90. T. sanctae Mariae Thotesberiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Bredon*]

91. Canonici Bredonie . . . Orate pro piissimo patre nostro Radulfo, et pro fratribus nostris scilicet domino Ricardo, Headmundo, Unfrido, Herewardo et pro aliis omnibus defunctis.

[*St. Mary, Blyth*]

92. T. sancte Mariae Blidae. Anima, etc. Orate pro nostris, Rogerio, Radulfo, Nicholao, Radulfo, Benigno, Ansberto, Willelmo, Gisleberto, Fulcone monachis et caeteris.

[*St. Mary, York*]

93. T. sanctae Mariae Eboracensis. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, York*]

94. T. sancti Petri Eboracensis ecclesiae. Orate p. nostris Aldredo, Thoma, Girardo, Thoma.

[*St. Germans, Selby*]

95. T. sancti Germani Salebiensis ecclesiae. Orate p. nostris Benedicto abbate, et ceteris.

[*St. Benedict, Ramsey*]

- p. 315. 96. T. sancti Benedicti Ramesiensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*Holy Trinity, Norwich*]

97. T. sanctae Trinitatis Norwicensis ecclesiae. Orate pro domino Herberto episcopo, patrono nostro et fundatore ecclesiae nostrae.

[*St. Benet's of Holme*]

98. T. sancti Benedicti Holmensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Ethelburga, Barking*]

99. T. sanctae Mariae et sanctae Aethelburgae Berkingensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Aelfgyva abbatissa, Lucia priorissa, Petronella priorissa, Scholastica, Perpetua, Mathilda, Athelidi, Mabilia, Emma, monialibus, et pro omnibus nostris defunctis.

100. T. sancti Petri Westmonasterii. Orate pro nostris, Offa, Aedgaro, Aedwardo, regibus; Matilda regina; Vitali, Gisleberto, Crispin, abbatibus; Riculfo, Turstino, Turkillo, Aegelwardo, Mauritio, Willelmo, monachis, et pro omnibus aliis.

[*St. Mary, Abingdon*]

- p. 316. 101. T. sancte Mariae Abbendonae. (No names.)

[Holy Trinity and St. Mary, Eynsham]

102. T. sanctae Trinitatis et sanctae Mariae Egneshamniae [Eynsham].
Orate pro nostris, Columbano abbate, Toma priore, Fulcone, Martino, Wilhelmo,
monachis; Rogero laico, Aethelmaro laico, Wilhelmo, et aliis quorum scit Deus
nomina.

[Holy Trinity and St. Fridesuride, Oxford]

p. 317. 103. T. sanctae Trinitatis et sanctae Fridesvidae Oxinefordensis.
(No names.)

[St. Andrew, Rochester]

104. T. sancti Andreae Rofensis aecclesiae. (No names.)

[Christ Church, Canterbury]

105. T. aecclesiae Christi Cantuariæ. (No names.)

[St. Peter and St. Augustine, Canterbury]

106. T. sancti Petri et sancti Augustini Anglorum apostoli. (No names.)

[St. Pancras, Lewes]

107. T. sancti Pancratii martyris. (No names.)

[St. Peter, Cerne]

p. 325. 141. T. sancti Petri apostoli Cerneliensis aecclesiae. (No names.)

[St. Mary, Sherborne]

p. 326. 142. T. sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae Scirburnensis ecclesiae. Hoc idem
persolvite nostris, Gregorio, Leofrico, Wlfrico, Segaro, Edwino priori Heremanno
monacho, Tobiae, Thoma, Aldredo, Alfeto.

[St. Mary, Hinckley]

p. 326. 145. T. sancte Marie Hinchelaiensis. Orate pro nostris, pro Radulfo,
pro Wilhelmo, pro Ema et pro Gilleberto, et pro Merevino presbitero.

[St. Martin, Battle]

p. 327. 146. T. sancti Martini de Bello. (No names.)

[Holy Trinity, Lenton, Nottingham]

147. T. aecclesiae sanctae Trinitatis de Notyngham. Orate pro nostris,
Hugone, Lamberto, prioribus; Walterio, Wlrico, Radulfo, Wilhelmo, Roberto,
Walterio, monachis et pro ceteris.

[St. Mary and St. Melor, Amesbury]

p. 328. 152. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Melori Ambresberiensis aecclesiae.
(No names.)

[St. Mary and St. Edith, Wilton]

153. T. sanctae Mariae sanctaeque Edithae Wiltoniensis ecclesiae. Orate
pro nostris scilicet domna abbatissa Wiltrudis, Elvitha, Brihtiva, Godiva,
Mathelda, priorissis; Susanna monacha, Ida, Beatrix, Ragenildis, Mathelda,
Eaditha, Ingritha; orate pro Rodberto comite, Mathilde, Mabilia, comitissis;
Agnete. Orate pro Ernulfo, capellano, Wilhelmo, Godrico, Odbrihto.

[*St. Peter, Muchelney*]

- p. 329. 154. T. sancti Petri Mycelaniensis aecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, Bath*]

155. T. sancti Petri apostoli Bathae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Aldhelm, Malmesbury*]

156. T. sancte Mariae et sancti Aldelmi confessoris Malmesberiensis ecclesie. Orate pro nostris, Aedelstano rege, Warion et Godefrido, abbatibus; Watselino et Radulfo, prioribus; Ricardo et Stephano monachis; Gerardo et Bernardo, fratribus; Elevisia, Mathilidi, sororibus; Walterrio et Ricardo, monachis et pro ceteris fidelibus, Siredo et aliis.

[*St. Giles, Barnwell, Cambridge*]

157. Sancti Egidii. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Belvoir*]

- p. 330. 158. T. sanctae Mariae de Belverio. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Wymondham*]

159. T. sanctae Mariae de Wymondsham. (No names.)

[*St. John, Pontefract*]

160. T. sancti Johannis aewangelistae de Pontefracto. (No names.)

[*St. Oswald, Nostell*]

161. T. sancti Oswaldi regis et martyris juxta Pontefractum. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Bridlington*]

162. T. sanctae Marie Bretlingtonensis. (No names.)

[*Holy Trinity, York*]

163. T. sancte Trinitatis Eboracensis. Orate pro domino (*sic*) Martino, Radulfo, Paganello, David, Tristanno (?), alio Radulfo, Salomone, monachis nostris.

[*St. Leonard, Bricet Magna*]

- p. 331. 164. T. sancti Leonardi de Briesetta. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Lincoln*]

165. T. sancte Mariae Lincoliensis. (No names.)

[*St. Oswald, Bardney*]

166. T. sancti Oswaldi regis et martyris in Bardanai. (No names.)

[*St. Peter and St. Swithun, Winchester*]

- p. 336. 182. T. sancti Petri et sancti Swithuni Wintoniensis aeccliesiae. Orate pro nostris, Kynegilso, Adwifo, Eduardo regibus; Ymina regina; Alwino, Walchelino, episcopis; Symeone abbate, Godefrido priore, Ricardo abbate, Ricardo, Hardingo, Lywingo, Ordmaro, Gozelino, Almaro, Alvrice, Felice, Bernardo, Alvredo, Rogerio, Kipingo, Alwino, et aliis omnibus. Orate et pro speciali fundatore aeccliesiae nostrae domno Frangswalone et domno Kileberto Ricardi filio, avunculo ejus, et Roberto de Humoets, et Ricardo.

[*St. Peter and St. Grimbald, Hyde, Winchester*]

- p. 337. 183. T. sancti Petri et sancti Grimbaldi Wintoniensis aeccliesiae. Orate pro nostris, Swartlingo, Alfnotho, Wlfwardo, Agelwio, Alfwinno, sacerdotibus; Hugone converso, Haymone, Eilavo, sacerdotibus; Henrico diacono, Benedicto cantore sacerdote, Gotselino, Hugone, Wlfwardo, sacerdotibus; Ysaac converso, Stephano acolita, Alfwinno converso, Willelmo, Godwino, Arnulfo, sacerdotibus et ceteris fratribus nostris.

[*St. Mary and St. Eadburg, Winchester*]

184. T. sanctae Mariae et sanctae Eadbargae virginis Wintoniensis. Orate pro nostris, pro abbatissa Beatrice; Mathilda, Emma priorissis; Oregia, Edita, cantrice; Alb., Godesteva, Cecilia, Ascelina, et ceteris aliis sororibus.

[*St. Mary, Romsey*]

185. T. sanctae Mariae Rumesiensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Petronilla, Cecilia, priorissis; Godiva, Gisla, Leoviva, Beatrice, Gilburge, monialibus, nuper defunctis, et caeteris omnibus.

[*St. Mary, Salisbury*]

186. T. sancte Marie Salesberiensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Edward, Shaftesbury*]

- p. 338. 187. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Eaduardi Sceptomiensis ecclesiae. Orate pro nostris, Eulalia abbatissa, Agnete priore, Albereda priore, et ceteris sororibus defunctis.

[*St. Mary and St. Samson, Milton*]

188. T. sanctae Mariae et sancti Sansonis Middeltononsis ecclesie. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, Montacute*]

- p. 339. 189. T. sancti Petri de Monte Acuto. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Glastonbury*]

190. T. sanctae Mariae Glastoniae. (No names.)

[*St. Peter and St. Etheldreda, Ely*]

191. T. sancti Petri apostolorum principis et Aetheldrethae virginis Elyensis aeccliesiae. Orate pro nostris defunctis, Aedgaro rege, Lefino, Teodwino, Ricardo, abbatibus; Sictrico preposito, Turstino preposito, Guthmundo secretario, Roberto monacho, Aelfwardo secretario, Aelfwino, Godpino de Wintonia, Wimero, Ribaldo, monachis, et pro omnibus aliis . . . II^o nonas julii obiit Walterus, monachus professus et sacerdos.

[*St. Mary, Spalding*]

192. T. sanctae Mariae Spallingensis aecclisiae. (No names.)

[*St. Bartholomew and St. Guthlaci, Crowland*]

- p. 340. 193. T. sancti Bartholomei et sancti Guthlaci Crolandie. (No names.)

[*St. Mary and St. Botulf, Thorney*]

194. T. sanctae Mariae sanctique Botalfi Thornensis aecclisiae. (No names.)

[*Peterborough*]

195. T. sancti Petri de Burch. (No names.)

[*Holy Trinity, Wallingford*]

196. T. sancte Trinitatis Werengefordie. (No names.)

[*Bury St. Edmunds*]

197. T. sancti Eadmundi regis et martyris. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Thetford*]

- p. 341. 198. T. sanctae Mariae de Tetford. (No names.)

[*St. Peter, Eye*]

199. T. sancti Petri Aeiæ. Orate pro nostris, Osberno abbate, Rotberto monacho, Rotberto Malet, Alwrico, Fredeberto, Ormaro, et pro ceteris fidelibus.

[*Holy Trinity, Colchester*]

200. T. sanctae Trinitatis Colecestriae. Orate p. nostris canonicis defunctis, Sirico, Eilavo, Gwaltero, Eadwino, Suenone, et ceteris.

[*St. Leonard, Stratford-by-Bow*]

201. T. sancti Leonardi Stratfordiensis ecclesiae. Pray for deceased sisters.

[*Holy Trinity or Christ Church, Aldgate*]

202. T. ecclesiae Christi Lundoniae. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Southwark*]

- p. 242. 203. T. sancte Mariae Suthewercensis aecclisiae. (No names.)

[*St. Paul, London*]

204. T. sancti Pauli Londoniensis ecclesiae. Versus Radulfe filii Fulcredi Cadomensis.

[*St. Mary, Reading*]

205. T. aecclisiae sanctae Mariae Radinsis. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Merton*]

206. T. ecclesiae sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae de Meretona. (No names.)

[*St. Mary, Malling*]

207. T. sanctae Mariae Mellings ecclesiae. (No names.)

[*St. Nicholas, Arundel*]

208. T. sancti Nicolai Arundellensis ecclesiae. (No names.)

The most notable feature of the names mentioned in the *Tituli* is the high proportion of those of Anglo-Saxon origin, particularly as most of the individuals seem to be those comparatively recently deceased. Thus, in Matilda's roll, the abbey of Milton provides the names Edred, Edward, Alfric and Aldwin, abbots, Bodric, Wulnoth, Agelmar, Ednoth, Wulfred, Alfric, Wulfgeat, Guthmund, Agelgar, Wulfric, Hradgar, Agelbert, Algar, Agelward and Alfric, monks; there is in fact not a single Anglo-Norman name in the list. To a less extent this applies to other entries, as for instance Wilton Abbey in the *Vitalis* roll where the one abbess and three out of the four prioresses are Anglo-Saxon. In the same roll the entry for Hyde Abbey, Winchester, is unusual for the classification adopted:—priests, conversi, cantor and acolite.

One final point should be noted in regard to certain of the names appearing in the *Rolls*. These are Arturus, canon of St. Paul's in Bruno's roll, Tristannus of Holy Trinity, York, in *Vitalis'* roll, and Belesend of Malling Abbey in Matilda's roll. The names of all three belong, of course, to the Arthurian cycle, and their occurrence would appear to be material evidence of the currency of that cycle at least as early as about 1050, the approximate central date for the births of the respective individuals.

KEY TO ABBREVIATED REFERENCES.

<i>A.A.</i>	<i>Archaeologia Aeliana</i> (Soc. Antiq. Newcastle-upon-Tyne)
<i>A.J.</i>	<i>Antiquaries Journal</i>
<i>Arch. Camb.</i>	<i>Archaeologia Cambrensis</i>
<i>Arch. J.</i>	<i>Archaeological Journal</i>
<i>Journ. B.A.A.</i>	<i>Journal of the British Archaeological Association</i>
<i>Proc. Brit. Acad.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
<i>Proc. Camb. Ant. Soc.</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridgeshire Antiquarian Society</i>
<i>R.I.B.A. Journal</i>	<i>Journal of Royal Institute of British Architects.</i>
<i>Somerset Arch. Soc. Trans.</i>	<i>Somerset Archaeological Society Transactions</i>
<i>Surrey Arch. Col.</i>	<i>Surrey Archaeological Collections</i>
<i>Trans. Dum. and Gal. N.H. and Ant. Soc.</i>	<i>Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society</i>
<i>Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.</i>	<i>Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1910

The Foundation of Lesnes Abbey. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* New Series xi, pp. 103-138.

Excavation of Lesnes Abbey. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* xi, pp. 155-161.

Topography of the Carmelite Priory of London. *Journ. B.A.A.* New Series xvi, pp. 15-32.

Architecture of the Friars in England. *The Antiquary* xlvii, (1) pp. 224-9; (2) 248-253. (Revised and reprinted in 'Some Famous Buildings and Their Story', see under 1913.)

1911

On the Topography of the Dominican Priory of London. *Archaeologia* lxi, pp. 57-84.

Benedictine Abbey of Barking. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* New Series xii, pp. 69-87.

Court House, or 'Old Town Hall', at Barking. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* xii, pp. 295-8.

1913

Articles contributed to SOME FAMOUS BUILDINGS AND THEIR STORY, published jointly with W. H. Godfrey. Technical Journals, Ltd. :

The Royal Palace of Nonsuch, Surrey.

The Tower of London and its Development.

The Origin of the Domestic Hall.

Cockersand Abbey and its Chapter House.

The Palaces of Hertford and Havering.

St. John of Jerusalem, Clerkenwell.
 The Abbey of Barking, Essex.
 The Friars as Builders.
 Queenborough Castle and its Builder.

Augustinian Priory of Little Leez and the Mansion of Leez Priory. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* New Series xiii, pp. 200-217.

Church of St. Clement, West Thurrock, Essex. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* xiii, pp. 53-60.

1914

Augustinian Priory Church of Little Dunmow, Colchester. *Essex Arch. Soc., Morant Club* xiii, pp. 285-292.

1915

LESNES ABBEY, in the Parish of Erith, Kent. London, 1915. pp. iii, +94+26 plans and figs. +26 Pls.

On the Topography of the Cistercian Abbey of Tower Hill. *Archaeologia* lxxvi, pp. 353-364.

Three Mediaeval Hospitals in London. *St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society* vii, p. 1.

1921

The Latin Monastic Buildings of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. *A.J.* i, pp. 3-18.

Three Monastic Houses of South Wales (Whitland Abbey, St. Dogmaels Abbey, Haverfordwest Priory). *Arch. Camb.* lxxvi, pp. 205-214.

Note on Pleshy Castle in 1558-9. *Trans. Essex Arch. Soc.* New Series xv, p. 160.

1922

BEELEIGH ABBEY, ESSEX. R. E. Thomas and Co., London. pp. xvi + 88. (With R. C. Fowler and others.)

Roman Mausolea of the Cart-Wheel type. *Arch. J.* lxxix, pp. 93-100.

Haverfordwest Priory. Report on the Excavations of June, 1922. *Arch. Camb.* 7th Series, ii, pp. 327-334 ; iv, p. 334.

1923

Architecture of the Premonstratensians with special reference to their Buildings in England. *Archaeologia* lxxiii, pp. 117-146.

Early Carved Stones from S. Kyme Church, Lincolnshire. *A.J.* iii, pp. 118-121.

1924

Parish of St. Helen, Bishopsgate, part i. *London Survey Committee (Memorials of Greater London)*. (Part Author.)

Review of Professor J. Brønsted, *Early English Ornament*. *Arch. J.* lxxxi, pp. 309-310.

1926

The Order of Grandmont and its Houses in England. *Archaeologia* lxxv, pp. 159-210. (With Dr. Rose Graham.)

Introduction to 'Pre-Conquest Stones in Lincolnshire', by the Rev. D. S. Davis. *Arch. J.* lxxxiii, pp. 1-7.

Priory and Manor House of Dartford. *Arch. J.* lxxxiii, pp. 67-85.

The Saxon Cathedral of Elmham. *A.J.* vi, pp. 402-9. (With W. H. Godfrey.)

Note on a carved marble lion from Colchester. *A.J.* vi, p. 450.

Review of G. Baldwin Brown, *The Arts in Early England: Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, 2nd Ed. *Arch. J.* lxxxiii, pp. 284-5.

Review of Jacques Meurgey, *Histoire de la Paroisse Saint-Jacques de-la-Boucherie*. *Arch. J.* lxxxiii, p. 285.

1927

Architectural Remains of Mendicant Orders in Wales. *Arch. J.* lxxxiv, pp. 88-104.

Excavations at Glastonbury Abbey. *A.J.* viii, pp. 324-5.

Review of W. J. Anderson and R. Phené Spiers, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, and *The Architecture of Ancient Rome*. *Arch. J.* lxxxiv, pp. 410-1.

1928

Carved Stones at Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire, and their position in the history of English Art. *Archaeologia* lxxvii, pp. 219-240.

St. Augustine's Abbey Church, Canterbury, before the Norman Conquest. *Archaeologia* lxxvii, pp. 201-218.

An Early Hall at Chilham Castle, Kent. *A.J.* viii, pp. 350-3.

Excavations at Glastonbury Abbey. *Somerset Arch. Soc. Trans.* lxxiv, pp. 1-9. (With Sir Charles Peers and Rt. Rev. Abbot Ethelbert Horne.)

Review of *Institut d'art et d'archéologie, Travaux des Etudiants du Groupe d'histoire de l'art de la Faculté des Lettres de Paris* (collection of essays). *Arch. J.* lxxxv, pp. 200-1.

Review of J. Strzygowski, *Early Church Art in Northern Europe*. *Arch. J.* lxxxv, pp. 202-3.

1929

Excavations at Glastonbury Abbey. *Somerset Arch. Soc. Trans.* lxxv, pp. 26-34. (With Sir Charles Peers and Rt. Rev. Abbot Ethelbert Horne.) Interim Report : *A.J.* x, pp. 24-9.

Review of T. Garner and A. Stratton, *Domestic Architecture of England during the Tudor Period*. *Arch. J.* lxxxvi, pp. 224-5.

Review of Miss Violet Markham, *Romanesque France*. *Arch. J.* lxxxvi, pp. 226-7.

Review of Basil Oliver, *The Cottages of England*. *Arch. J.* lxxxvi, pp. 229-30.

Review of Sir Aurel Stein, *On Alexander's Track to the Indus*. *Arch. J.* lxxxvi, p. 233.

1930

ENGLISH ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE (1) Before the Conquest. Oxford Univ. Press, pp. xx + 168 + 52 plans and figs. + 65 Pls.

The Monastery of Cluny, 910-1155. *Archaeologia* lxxx, pp. 143-178. (With Dr. Rose Graham.)

Review of G. Baldwin Brown, *The Arts in Early England, volume VI, part i*. *Arch. J.* lxxxvii, p. 380.

1931

Cistercian Order in Ireland. *Arch. J.* lxxxviii, pp. 1-36; Part II, pp. 20-36. (With H. G. Leask.)

Three Carved Stones in the Society's Collection. *A.J.* xi, pp. 133-5.

Obituary Notice : Philip Norman. *A.J.* xi, p. 278.

Review of J. W. Crowfoot, *Churches at Jerash*. *Antiquity* v, p. 527.

Review of Dr. Joan Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny*. *Arch. J.* lxxxviii, pp. 309-310.

Review of Dr. D. H. Fleming, *St. Andrew's Cathedral Museum*. *Antiquity* v, p. 314.

Review of Professor R. A. S. Macalister, *Tara : The Pagan Sanctuary of Ancient Ireland*. *Arch. J.* lxxxviii, pp. 316-7.

Review of Professor Kingsley Porter, *The Crosses and Culture of Ireland*. *Arch. J.* lxxxviii, pp. 302-3.

1932

Excavations at Glastonbury Abbey. *Somerset Arch. Soc. Trans.* lxxviii, pp. 109-110. (With Sir Charles Peers and Rt. Rev. Abbot Ethelbert Horne.)

The Renaissance of Architecture and Stone-Carving in Southern France in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries (Annual Lecture on Aspects of Art). *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, Vol. xviii, pp. 47-66.

Obituary Notice : Professor G. Baldwin Brown. *R.I.B.A. Journal* xxxix, August 6th, p. 763.

Review of T. D. Atkinson, *The Architectural History of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Etheldreda at Ely*. *Arch. J.* lxxxix, pp. 306-7.

Review of Arthur Gardner, *Medieval Sculpture in France*. *A.J.* xii, pp. 312-3.

Review of Dr. Adolf Mahr, *Christian Art in Ancient Ireland*. *Arch. J.* lxxxix, pp. 302-3.

Review of *Rocque's Map of Surrey* (1762), Surrey Arch. Soc. *Arch. J.* lxxxix, pp. 324-5.

1933

Recent Discoveries in the Nave of Westminster Abbey. *Archæologia* lxxxiii, pp. 227-236. (With L. E. Tanner.)

A Figure of Christ in Majesty at Barnack. Note. *A.J.* xiii, p. 468.

The Later Periods of English Domestic Architecture. *Surrey Arch. Col.*, volume xli, pp. 110-6.

Review of W. H. Godfrey (Ed.), *Lewes, Official Guide*. *Arch. J.* xc, p. 165.

Review of Mlle. Françoise Henry : *La Sculpture irlandaise pendant les douze premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne*. *A.J.* xiii, pp. 476-9.

Review of Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments (Scotland) : *Fife, Kinross and Clackmannan*. *Arch. J.* xc, pp. 155-6.

1934

ENGLISH ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE (2) After the Conquest. Oxford Univ. Press, pp. xvi + 180 + 43 plans and figs. + 47 pls.

Notes on the Origins of Hiberno-Saxon Art. *Antiquity* viii, pp. 43-57.

Review of D. R. Buxton, *Russian Medieval Architecture*. *Antiquity* viii, p. 368.

Review of C. J. P. Cave, *The Roof Bosses of Winchester Cathedral*. *Arch. J.* xci, p. 335.

Review of J. Arnott Hamilton, *Byzantine Architecture and Decoration*. *Antiquity* viii, p. 496.

Review of Chester H. Jones, *Ancient Architecture : a commentary in verse*. *Antiquity* viii, p. 490.

1935

Review of D. T. Fyfe, *Hellenistic Architecture*. *Arch. J.* xcii, pp. 374-5.

Review of J. Virey, *Les Églises romanes de l'ancien diocèse de Macon*. *A.J.* xv, pp. 222-3.

1936

ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE IN WESTERN EUROPE. Oxford Univ. Press, pp. xvi + 208 + 58 plans + 44 Pls.

Review of Roger Hinks, *Carolingian Art*. *Antiquity* x, p. 113.

Review of Dr. Paul Nørlund, *Viking Settlers in Greenland*. *Arch. J.* xciii, pp. 131-2.

Review of *The Victoria History of the County of Sussex*, Volume III. *A.J.* xvi, pp. 218-9.

1937

The Church of Quintanilla de las Vinas. *A.J.* xvii, pp. 16-27. (With W. M. Whitehill.)

Review of A. Gardner, *Introduction to French Church Architecture*. *Arch. J.* xciv, p. 298.

Review of A. R. Martin, *Franciscan Architecture in England*. *A.J.* xvii, pp. 455-6.

1938

Some Minor Irish Cathedrals, in *Medieval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*. Harvard Univ. Press. Vol. ii, pp. 699-708.

Review of Dr. G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama*. *Arch. J.* xcv, pp. 226-7.

Review of *The Victoria History of the County of Sussex*. Volume IX. *A.J.* xviii, pp. 89-90.

1940

Presidential Address to the Society of Antiquaries. *A.J.* xx, pp. 317-328.

Review of Pierre David, *La Cathédrale de Grenoble*. *Antiquity* xiv, p. 221.

1941

Presidential Address to the Society of Antiquaries. *A.J.* xxi, pp. 185-196.

Review of W. M. Whitehill, *Spanish Romanesque Architecture of the eleventh century*. *Antiquity* xv, pp. 393-5.

1942

Presidential Address to the Society of Antiquaries. *A.J.* xxii, pp. 157-166.

1943

Presidential Address to the Society of Antiquaries. *A.J.* xxiii, pp. 87-97.

The Cross Shaft at Nith Bridge. *Trans. Dum. and Gal. N.H. and Ant. Soc.* : 3rd Series, xxii, p. 183.

1944

Presidential Address to the Society of Antiquaries. *A.J.* xxiv, pp. 85-93.

1945

Report and Address on the Structure of Merchant Taylors Hall. Printed by the Company for private circulation as Appendix A, pp. 47-55, in *A Brief History of the Worshipful Company of Merchant Taylors*, by R. T. D. Sayle.

Review of P. G. M. Dickinson, *Historic Fotheringay*. *Arch. J.* cii, p. 174.

1946

Fountains Abbey. *The Times*, September 10th.

1947

Review of F. Masai, *Essai sur les Origines de la Miniature d'Île Irlandaise*. *Arch. J.* civ, pp. 196-7.

1948

No. 5 Market Hill, Cambridge. *Proc. Camb. Ant. Soc.* xli, p. 56-9.

1949

Review of John Harvey, *Gothic England*. *Arch. J.* civ, pp. 197-8.

Review of T. D. Kendrick, *Later Saxon and Viking Art*. *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 2477, July 22nd.

Review of J. Laffargue and G. Fouet, *Peintures Romanes, Vestiges Gallo-Romains à Saint-Plancard*. *Arch. J.* civ, p. 198.

1950

ROMANESQUE ARCHITECTURE IN ENGLAND. *The British Council*, pp. 44 + plans + 16 Pls.

The York Virgin and its Date. *Arch. J.* cv, pp. 6-13.

Foreword to *Medieval Studies presented to Rose Graham*. Oxford Univ. Press, pp. v-vii.

Romanesque Architecture, *Chambers' Encyclopaedia*. New Edition, Volume I, pp. 558-9.

The Saxon Gap. *Architectural Review* cviii (November), pp. 281-4.

Two carved stones at Monkwearmouth. *A.A.* Vol. xxviii (4th Series), pp. 1-6.

Some disputed examples of pre-Conquest Sculpture. *Antiquity* xxv (1951).

St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. *Ministry of Works Guide* (1951).

Thornton Abbey, Lincolnshire. *Ministry of Works Guide* (1951).

Whitby Abbey, Yorkshire. *Ministry of Works Guide* (1951).

- The Survival of Gothic in 17th-century England. *Arch. J.*
 Supplement to cvi pp. 4-9
- The Form of the Early Choir of Tewkesbury
 and its Significance „ pp. 10-15
- Some Minor Irish Cathedrals „ pp. 16-39
- Three Bede-Rolls „ pp. 40-53

1911-1912

Contributions to the Victoria County Histories of Berkshire, Hertfordshire, Worcestershire and Yorkshire.

1916-1948

Editor of Inventories published by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England) for the counties of Essex, Huntingdon, London, Hereford, Middlesex, Westmorland, Oxford (City), and part of Dorset, including Sectional Prefaces and other special articles.

1928-1949

Historical and architectural descriptions and plans of cathedrals, churches and other buildings in the districts covered by the Royal Archaeological Institute's Meeting Reports :

Rochester,	1928 (vol. 83)
Canterbury,	1929 (vol. 84)
Bath,	1930 (vol. 85)
King's Lynn,	1932 (vol. 87)
Leicester,	1933 (vol. 88)
York,	1934 (vol. 89)
Chichester,	1935 (vol. 90)
Edinburgh,	1936 (vol. 91)
Chester,	1937 (vol. 92)
Rouen,	1938 (vol. 93)
Dumfries,	1939 (vol. 94)
Lincoln,	1946 (vol. 103)
Salisbury,	1947 (vol. 104)
York,	1948 (vol. 105)
Norwich,	1949 (vol. 106)
Taunton,	1950 (vol. 107)

EARTHWORK SINCE HADRIAN ALLCROFT*

By R. E. M. WHEELER

In 1908—the year, incidentally, in which our Royal Commissions on Ancient and Historical Monuments were established—a monumental volume of some 700 pages was published under the title of *Earthwork of England*. It became at once a Standard Work and a handbook to the new Commissioners and their staffs. It marked the end of an epoch, though strangely with scarce a hint of the beginning of the next. Its author, Hadrian Allcroft, had industriously collected a mass of superficial material which, for lack of a better yard-stick, he had classified under the formal categories proposed by the old Committee on Ancient Earthworks and Fortified Enclosures. It was not without merit and is still occasionally of some slight use—no mean epitaph for a technical work nearly half a century old. But it throws into sharp relief the achievement of the subsequent generation of field-archaeologists, and this contrast was borne in upon me anew when recently, after ten years' absence from European archaeology, I made some attempt to bring my archaeological reading in this country up to date. I was able to review, with an unusual detachment, our post-Allcroft progress in these matters, and, when your Secretariat demanded a paper of me for your programme, I thought that a few notes on certain aspects of this progress might not be inapposite. Time compels me to limit myself this afternoon principally to one category of earthworks—hill-forts or camps—and within that category to restrict myself to one or two problems.

Allcroft was moved to lament our native indifference in these matters. 'Characteristically the English,' he affirms, 'who have done so much for the Hittite, the Minoan, and the Egyptian, have as yet scarcely concerned themselves to apply the same methods to the secrets of their soil. Yet Comparative Archaeology is the one and only key which can unlock those secrets, and in the few cases where the test has been applied the results have been so abundant and startling that only the national disregard of everything national can explain the lack of a host of scientific diggers at home. Our enthusiasms, in this as in other matters, are all for the wider world beyond the seas, and mostly for other peoples than our own kindred.' So in 1908. To-day the boot is on the other foot. To-day, if we must compare these things, we have to confess that at least nine-tenths of our archaeological talent is employed upon a painstaking analysis of our ultimate prehistoric slums, whilst major civilizations and cultures of world-wide significance, main arteries of history and prehistory, patiently await the favour of our attention in other parts of the world. But I must not in the present context sidetrack myself yet again into that troublesome and thorny byepath.

* Read to the Institute at Burlington House, London, on the 14th March, 1951.

It is more relevant, as an index of our knowledge in 1908, to recall that our hill-forts were then still conventionally attributed to the Bronze Age. Maiden Castle in Dorset, for example, was confidently described by Allcroft as 'certainly a permanent settlement in the Bronze Age', whereas a very slightly wiser generation now knows that the Bronze Age was in fact the only prehistoric or protohistoric period, from the neolithic onwards, in which Maiden Castle was *not* occupied. On general (but unspecified) grounds it was furthermore agreed that 'a camp is later in date according as it is less irregular in plan, less elaborately defended, and constructed upon a less elevated and less defensible site'. Here lurks, I suspect, a shadow of the Victorian cult of progress. It is a pity to have to add that two or three decades of subsequent work have largely reversed this view and have shown our most elaborate multivallate earthworks to be of relatively late date, our earlier earthworks having often been quite moderately embanked and sometimes notably regular in their planning. My point is not now that Allcroft's conclusions have been proved wrong in the light of much later research, but that they were in origin, perhaps in the manner of their age, based very largely upon traditional theory. We of course do not fall into that sort of quagmire nowadays. Or do we? I like to think that a closer fraternization with objective science has in fact improved the substantiality of our logic, and that even an occasional flirtation with Karl Marx, shocking though it be, has not been entirely deleterious in this respect.

On the whole it may be affirmed with truth that the advance in knowledge of these things during the four centuries between Leland and Hadrian Allcroft was infinitesimal compared with that during the four decades or so which separate *Earthwork of England* from the present day. We have only to compare a work such as Professor Gordon Childe's *Prehistoric Communities of the British Isles* (1947) to appreciate the meaning of that statement. Let us now proceed to review and consider for a few minutes certain of the more outstanding achievements of those four decades. In doing so we shall have to omit much of value, but the main course is clear enough. The first event of note was the excavation of Hengistbury Head in 1911 by Mr. J. P. Bushe-Fox, and it is right that this piece of work should head the list, for it was the firm foundation of much that was to follow. I cannot refer to its author altogether dispassionately, and indeed have no desire to do so. In so far as I was taught the art of digging at all, Bushe-Fox was my first and only master. The few weeks that I spent under him as a student at Wroxeter in 1913 taught me more than the elements of a technique; they taught me, I hope, something of the objective approach to first-hand evidence in the field, an approach combining the analytical, the sceptical and the constructive in a fashion that cannot be learned from books. The published records of Bushe-Fox's digging, invaluable though they be, do less than justice to his astuteness, his shrewd common-sense, in

the interpretation of his actual sections in the field. I take a deep pleasure, here and now, in paying this tribute to my master : although, let me add, he treated me abominably. He shut me up in the drawing-office at Wroxeter (I was supposed to be studying pottery) and wired my legs to the table to prevent my escape ; and when I did burst my bonds and emerge suddenly on to the site again, he sent me in search of truth to the bottom of the deepest and dirtiest well and kept me there until I became almost a ritual deposit. I have no doubt that all this was part of my training ; anyway, in my time I have done my best to pass it on.

In the Hengistbury Report the superlative contribution to knowledge was the recognition of the Ultimate Hallstatt wares that were to become the foundation of the Early Iron Age A of the Hawkes classification, whereof I shall say more in a few minutes. That discovery opened a new door into our prehistory, even though the door is, we must confess, still only very slightly ajar. Let us not forget that Bushe-Fox was the first to break and enter ; but others were not long in following him. In that same year, 1911, began the exploration of the famous settlement at All Cannings Cross by the Cunningtons who at this time were diligently ploughing lonely but productive furrows in the country round Devizes. Their work on this classic site at once amplified the setting of Bushe-Fox's Hengistbury and planted the British Hallstatt firmly on its feet.

Nor have I yet finished with that *annus mirabilis*, 1911. For, though aside from our main subject, that was also the year of the publication of Bulleid and Gray's monograph on the excavated mounds of the Glastonbury Lake Village, which had gradually, since 1892, yielded a dramatic complex of information, including a complete village-plan. To our Iron Age archaeology, the Glastonbury Lake Village is what Silchester is to Romano-British studies. The two excavations were contemporary with each other, and both produced a comprehensive mass of unanalytical evidence which was nevertheless exactly what the era required.

Thereafter ensued something of a hiatus, bridged by occasional lone-hands such as Willoughby Gardner and Harold Hughes who, before and after the First German War, were wringing reluctant evidence, sometimes of a rather surprising kind, from the hill-forts of Wales. Willoughby Gardner's work was summarized by its author in his presidential address to the Cambrian Archaeological Association in 1926, and, if I may be allowed to mention it, I had previously, in 1921, at King's College, London, discussed (in a state of acute terror, I remember) some of the problems of these forts in my first public discourse which, in spite of the inauspicious day of its delivery, Friday the 13th of May, seems on the whole to have been a tolerably sturdy child. And it was in the early post-war years that Cyril Fox began those explorations of the Cambridgeshire dykes which have set the pattern for work of that kind, probably for all time. I shall not again this afternoon find occasion to refer to Fox's contribution to our study of earthwork, whether

of cross-country dykes or of barrows, but we must all be deeply conscious of it in our estimate of progress.

The next great phase opened in the later 'twenties and continued until the Second German War. In 1925 (or was it 1924?) my excavations on the site of a Roman fort near Brecon in South Wales had been joined by two charming, young and earnest, but not too earnest, Wykehamists, of whom one is now an Oxford professor and the other is Bodley's Librarian. I was never quite sure whether I was a dozen years older than they or a dozen years younger, and their stately progress from honour to honour during the past quarter-century has not helped me to resolve my doubt. Be that as it may, theirs was always a vintage year, whether at Winchester or subsequently at Oxford. The Hampshire Field Club, in the revered personality of Williams-Freeman, had long led in the local study of earthwork. But when in 1929 it published the mature *juvenilia* of Messrs. Hawkes, Myres and Stevens in the celebrated report on St. Catharine's Hill, it leapt into the front rank of earthwork-scholarship, and even Wiltshire trembled for its laurels. Important in itself, this very notable excavation was perhaps even more important in that it provided a stimulus for the production in 1931 of Hawkes's new, and now standard, classification of the British Iron Age.¹ About that classification I shall have one or two things to say in a few minutes.

During these years much work of a high order was being done by a number of part-time (less invidious word than 'amateur') fieldworkers, chief amongst whom we may unhesitatingly place the Curwens. Our debt to them for their devoted work in Sussex is familiar but can never be over-emphasized. Further west it was supplemented on a smaller but still important scale by Miss Liddell in Hampshire and Devon. In Hampshire, too, Professor Hawkes continued his fieldwork in the years before the recent war, and in Dorset my colleagues, notably Miss Richardson, and I probed the Wessex cultures at Maiden Castle, Poundbury, and Chalbury. In Yorkshire and Cheshire and on the Welsh border, Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Varley and Miss Kenyon were gallantly tackling the unexuberant but important hill-fort cultures of those regions; whilst in Herefordshire, Worcestershire and Leicestershire Mrs. Hencken, and recently again Miss Kenyon, have produced results of outstanding value in areas otherwise largely unexplored. In Scotland, Dr. A. O. Curle, Professor Childe and Professor and Mrs. Piggott have striven with the negative cultures which are the habit of the Highland Zone, always with the baffling problem of survival-values as an incidental complication. And much other excellent work is for brevity excluded from this summary list.

The general outcome of this immense body of excavation and interpretation was stated recently and judiciously by Professor Piggott in his *British Prehistory* (1949), and in the summary published in the previous year by the Council for British Archaeology in its *Survey and*

¹ *Antiquity*, v (1931), 60ff.

Policy of Field Research, Part I. No fresh synthesis is therefore needed at the present time, and I propose to restrict myself to one or two selected aspects for brief discussion as samples of the sort of problem that we find ourselves up against in this post-Allcroft era. First among these problems is inevitably that of the basic system on which we all nowadays found our evidence and our theories. I refer of course to the Hawkes Classification.

The Hawkes Classification of our Early Iron Age cultures into A, B and C is probably the most brilliant and substantial single contribution yet made in this country during the present century to the mechanism of British prehistory. With examples before us of the extent to which a fallacious or inadequate classification can obstruct the progress of thought, we can scarcely be grateful enough for a system which at once freed our insular archaeology from the embarrassments of continental categories and chronologies that are more often than not inapplicable to *ultima Thule*. To these continental systems, our own provincial cultures—fragmentary, tardy, modified by insular elements or by sheer isolation—could only be fitted by the drastic methods of Procrustes, and Professor Hawkes arrived amongst us in 1931 as a veritable Theseus.

Now for twenty years the Hawkes Classification has stoutly sustained an increasing burden of evidence. If at long last it begins to creak a little under the weight, that is merely the way of nature. I feel sure that the architect of the scheme is himself, above all others, conscious of the increasing strain, and to him we look in confidence for the necessary reinforcement, or even perhaps for some measure of reconstruction. As he himself has remarked, 'The A-B-C terminology is no more than a set of symbols for use while we are feeling our way towards the correct identification of culture-groups defined in factual terms of time and space.'²

On coming back to the subject after the lapse of years, it seems to me that in two main respects we may have in the future to watch our application of the basic Hawkes scheme to our accumulating evidence. First, there is the tendency, a rather dangerous one as I see it, to equate *domestic* cultures—pots, brooches and the like—with *military* cultures (if we so choose to call them), that is, with methods of attack and defence. Brave statements such as 'Arriving as they did anything up to two centuries later than the Iron Age A people, the invaders of Iron Age B brought with them a more advanced technique of fortification' were perfectly legitimate generalizations in 1931, but may be regarded with considerable suspicion in 1951. To that matter I shall return in a few minutes. The second danger is perhaps of a more insidious kind. It is that, alternatively, of loosening the classification until it ceases effectively to classify, or of squeezing into it evidence which does not readily fit—in fact, of more Procrustes. Let me amplify this difficulty for a few moments.

² *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, lxxx (1939), 238.

The essence of the classification was that Iron Age A comprised cultures derived largely from the Hallstatt cultures of the continent, although these elements reached Britain mainly in the La Tène I and II periods (between 500 and 200 B.C.); that Iron Age B was based on La Tène cultures abroad, and arrived in La Tène II and III (between 300 and the 1st century B.C.); and that Iron Age C was essentially Belgic and arrived after c. 75 B.C.

First, Iron Age A. In my interim report on Maiden Castle in 1935³ I rashly proposed a subdivision into A1 and A2, in an attempt to clarify certain typological distinctions which had been detected at that site, at All Cannings Cross and elsewhere. Shortly afterwards I withdrew that subdivision, and in my final Maiden Castle report I firmly renounced it. But it is apparently easier to launch a ship than to sink it. A1 and A2 have entered consistently into the corpus of our more recent Iron Age literature and nothing can apparently be done about it. Nevertheless it is, I still maintain, a most insecure and perilous division, and is based upon a number of hypotheses, such as the progressive degradation of the situlate urn, which are not substantiated in fact from region to region. Instead of A1's and A2's, in the present state of knowledge I urge a more exact analysis and definition of the penny-packets of our Iron Age A on a strictly topographical basis, along the lines indeed clearly enough indicated by Professor Hawkes himself in the sentence which I have quoted above (p. 66). A1 and A2, I submit, give a specious chronological precision to the problem before we are anything like ready for it.⁴ But I will not this afternoon take time for this question. More important and urgent is the multiple problem of Iron Age B.

If you were to ask me at the present moment to amplify or even apply the initial definition of Iron Age B, I should be at a loss to answer. I find that it includes Professor Hawkes's 3rd-century 'Marnians' in Sussex, with their pedestalled and carinated pots, their 'saucepans', and their smooth 'soapy' fabric.⁵ It includes Mr. Ward Perkins's late pre-Roman 'South-eastern B' with its omphalos-bowls.⁶ It includes the plain bead-rim pottery of the 1st century B.C. in the south-west⁷; the bowls of the 1st centuries B.C.-A.D. with rebated rims and duck- or S-pattern from Cornwall, Worcestershire, the Welsh border and Aberystwyth⁸; and the wares with curvilinear decoration from the midlands, the south and the south-west. And there are others. Now, in all this miscellany there is *no*, repeat *no*, common denominator. Chronology, type, origin, location are as diverse as they could be. So far from classifying all this as B, I should myself prefer to call it X. The cistern called B has burst and ceased to contain its seething load.

³ *Ant. Journ.*, xv (1935), 274.

⁴ Indeed we can never fully appreciate the chronological factors in our insular Iron Age A until more work has been done in northern France, particularly in Normandy. See below.

⁵ *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, lxxx (1939), 230ff.

⁶ *Proc. Prehist. Soc.*, iv (1938), 152ff.

⁷ *My Maiden Castle, Dorset* (1943), pp. 204ff.

⁸ T. C. Hencken in *Arch. Journ.*, xcv (1938), 88ff.; and subsequent work by Kathleen Kenyon at Sutton Walls, Herefordshire.

Nor does the difficulty end there. If those Sussex Marnians are to be given an individual standing, even in alliance with the native A-folk, what about the Dorset Marnians? In the A culture of Maiden Castle, and as deeply in it as stratigraphy can compel,^a are pedestals as Marnian as any in Sussex; so also, though not differentially stratified, at Little Woodbury. But if we are to call these 'B', so that 'Maiden Castle A' becomes from the outset (say, 250 B.C.) 'Maiden Castle AB', what are we to do with the really significant change when the bead-rims arrive in Dorset in the 1st century B.C.? For these are B, if ever there was one, and the resultant cross between them and the earlier culture produces as clear an AB complex as one could wish. Here then is a terminological impasse. We are confronted with the queer equation *AB does not equal AB*. The only solution is presumably to retain the unqualified term A for the original Maiden Castle culture, admitting Marnian or La Tène elements as an integral part of A. After all, have we not always done so in the matter of brooches, which, though of La Tène I and often of devolved types, are freely admitted (for there are no others) to the sodality of Iron Age A? But—and let us keep clear heads over this—if we admit Marnian elements as integral with A in Dorset, we can scarcely exclude them from the A of Sussex. Nor, as I see it, is there any real reason why we should. For at the best our A is already a very heterogeneous assemblage of types and cultures. It includes finger-tip ornament of the kind picked up by the Late Bronze Age Urnfield cultures in their north-westerly progress; it includes faint traces of the polychromy of the central European Hallstatt; it includes a miscellany of small bowls with Rhenish and Marnian affinities; it includes pedestals, etc., again reminiscent of Marnian types. It includes all these things and more, but how far the complex coalesced in this country and how far its admixture was in part the result of previous interactions on the continent, we simply do not know. Nor can we ever know clearly on the basis of the British evidence alone. The exploration of further continental groups and sites such as Les Jogasses is an essential preliminary to the sorting out of our own confused *mélange*.

All this may seem to be a mere matter of terminology, but there is of course more to it than that. Terminology frames our concepts, and a false or muddled terminology gives them the wrong shape. Whole-time students such as Professors Hawkes and Piggott will not be misled, but the part-timers upon whom, as I have said, much of our archaeological progress in this country has always depended will inevitably find it increasingly difficult to see straight. Initial cultural admixtures will be subdivided into invasions. Essential diversities will be grouped to constitute fallacious complexes. As one who is a layman in these matters, I appeal once more for a more rigid classification, based upon an exact study of local cultures in their stratigraphical relations. And

^a *My Maiden Castle*, p. 203.

this means an exact study, not merely in the secondary regions comprised by Britain, but also, let me repeat, in the more nearly primary regions overseas. My small contribution to this problem in 1938 and 1939 was largely frustrated by the war, when substantive results were just beginning to emerge. Here is an opportunity (amongst many others) for the new co-ordinating committee set up in 1950 at Zurich by the Prehistoric Conference, happily with Professor Hawkes as a British representative.

During the past few minutes I have turned somewhat aside from my main subject, but make no apology for doing so. Indeed, I am in some sense on the point of turning still further aside. True enough, a proper appreciation of our great earthworks—Cissbury, Hunsbury, Maiden Castle and the rest—is wrapped up in the proper appreciation of the associated cultures. But, as to a cautionary tale, I now turn to another aspect: to a matter of another kind where, if I may say so with the greatest good-will, the woolliness of a considerable number of sheep has combined to cloak the wolf of a problem. I refer to the extremely important and interesting groups of British and Continental 'camps' fortified in a manner which has, sometimes rightly and sometimes wrongly, been thought to represent the 'Gallic wall', *murus Gallicus*, of Caesar's Commentaries, and has received new and active attention in the post-Allcroft epoch. The term *murus Gallicus* has indeed been bandied about widely and often recklessly amongst archaeologists since, between 1852 and 1887, the type was first identified and discussed by de Caumont, Castagné and de la Noë.¹⁰ Recently, arising out of my discovery and partial excavation of two examples in north-western France in 1938, Mrs. M. Aylwin Cotton has spent an infinitude of effort upon the assembly and analysis of relevant evidence in this country and abroad, and when her invaluable work is published we shall have as firm a basis to build on as the very variable nature of that evidence will allow. Meanwhile I have unblushingly drawn upon Mrs. Cotton's material and will use it with all gratitude to amplify certain observations which at the present stage the developing problem seems to demand.

My first observation is that we have here once more an accumulation of loose and confused thinking which very badly needs straightening. The term *murus Gallicus* has been and is being used or abused in a variety of un-Caesarian senses, and it is high time that we redefined exactly what we mean by it. We have indeed no real choice in the matter. Has not Caesar told us, in simple, precise language that a child can (and often does) construe? Let me remind you of the familiar passage from his account of his siege of Avaricum (Bourges) in 58 B.C.:

'All Gallic walls', he says, 'are approximately of this form. Transverse beams are assembled on the ground throughout the length of the

¹⁰ De Caumont in *Bulletin Monumental*, xviii (1852), 241-2 (see also *ibid.* xxiv, 659-62); Castagné, *ibid.* xxiv (1868), 662-7; General de la

Noë in *Bulletin de Géographie Historique et Descriptive*, 1887, pp. 119ff.

wall at equal intervals, distant 2 feet from one another. These are fastened within, and are covered with a great mound of earth : whilst the intervals which I have mentioned are revetted in front with large stones. When these (beams) have been assembled and clamped together, another stage is added above, so that the same interval as before is maintained and the beams of one stage do not touch those of the next, but are carefully held apart at equal distances with stones between each of them. Thus stage by stage the whole work is knit together until the required height of the wall is reached. This work is, on the one hand, not unsightly in appearance, with its varied alternation of beams and stones marshalled in straight lines ; and, on the other hand, it provides an admirably serviceable defence for towns, since the masonry protects from fire and the timber from the battering-ram. For with continuous beams, generally 40 feet long and fastened within, it can neither be breached nor pulled to pieces.' (*De Bello Gallico* vii, 23.)

The features of the Gallic Wall, therefore, are these : it is bonded at close stages by longitudinal and transverse timbers fastened securely together, but each stage is isolated by earth and facing stones from the stages above and below. There was no continuous, all-over, facing wall ; it was the *intervals* between the outer ends of the transverse timbers that were walled up, and the lines of timber-heads were a spectacular feature of the façade. The dual purpose was to isolate the combustible material in such a manner as to minimize the risk of general conflagration, but at the same time to bond the wall as rigidly as possible against the battering-ram. Let me emphasize those vital words of Caesar's : *et ab incendio lapis et ab ariete materia defendit*. Fire and battery were obviously two very present risks.

Now in our wisdom we know of course to-day a good deal more than Julius Caesar knew (or told) about his native contemporaries, in Britain if not in Gaul. But in the present instance we must, I fear, take him strictly at his word. Whatever his carelessness of La Tène art and social culture, he at least knew a Gallic wall from hard, head-on experience ; and *his* Gallic wall must be *our* Gallic wall, lock, stock and barrel. We have no right to change or adapt his definition, or to pretend that the functions and qualities ascribed to his wall were merely accidental. We have no right to include with it just *any* sort of wall which incorporates timber and masonry in its composition, whatever the relative arrangement of its parts. If we try to do these things, as in fact we have, we shall land ourselves in the muddle in which, in fact, we actually find ourselves. But before commenting further upon that matter, there are other little questions of geography and chronology that must first be considered briefly.

Adhering strictly, as I insist again that we must, to the precise Caesarian definition, *muri Gallici* are distributed as follows :—18 certain examples in France, 3 in Germany, 2 reasonably certain ones in Switzerland, and 1 in Scotland. We might add 7 possible examples in France

and 7 possible or approximate examples in Britain ; but for the moment I prefer to keep the map free from doubt. The French distribution would appear to be significant : it coincides with Gallia Comata or Shaggy Gaul, extending down to but *not crossing* the frontier of the Roman




FIG. 1. SKETCH-MAP OF *muri Gallici* IN FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND

(By courtesy of Mrs. M. Evelyn Cotton)

Province, which was established in 121 B.C. (fig. 1). It thins out in Gallia Belgica. It coincides, in other words, with the Caesarian battle-area of 58-51 B.C., and we have Caesar's word for it that it was the

normal type in 58 B.C. It is a plain inference that the distribution as we have it is bracketed between that date and 121 B.C.

Can we narrow this bracket? To some extent we can. At the Petit Celland, near Avrenches in western Normandy, I found in 1938 that the main rampart was a conventional *muris Gallicus*, that the camp as a whole had never been completed, that there was only one occupation-layer in the areas tested, and that this layer at the main entrance was associated with an abundant native coinage of the Caesarian period.¹¹ At Huelgoat, in Central Brittany, I found equivalent evidence though less fully documented in a large camp which had in part been burnt¹² (fig. 2). Both sites I have little hesitation in associating with the Caesarian episode of 56 B.C. For what it is worth, Durand concluded in 1899 from his excavations in the Crêt Châtelard, near Chassenay (Loire), that this oppidum with its *muris Gallicus* was built immediately before the Roman occupation of the region. Éperandieu thought that the *muris Gallicus* of Alesia was of the 1st century B.C. and had not been in existence for more than a few years at the time of the Caesarian conquest. More recently (1937) the *muris Gallicus* of the Ring of Otzenhausen in the Rhine Province has been attributed to the Treveri of the 1st century B.C.; the rampart overlay Late La Tène sherds.¹³ Similarly Déchelette regarded the most easterly outlier of the *muris-Gallicus* series, the camp of Manching near the Danube in Bavaria, as an oppidum of the Vindelici before their submission to the Romans in 15 B.C., and the re-examination of the site by Wagner in 1938 produced nothing inconsistent with this conclusion.¹⁴ Indeed it has yet to be shown that any *muris Gallicus* in France or Germany was built before the 1st century B.C., and the evidence converges on the Caesarian period with an occasional hangover (as at Manching) on the periphery of the Roman world.

We have then a distinctive fire-proof and ram-proof type of rampart which was clearly enough evolved in non-Roman Gaul on the eve of the Roman conquest. The type would appear to have been a standardized variation of the Late Bronze Age or Hallstatt bonded and revetted rampart,¹⁵ imposed upon the Gauls by Roman methods of attack. The characteristic Hallstatt-Early La Tène rampart, with its continuous vertical palisade-posts and its camp-sheeting or loose stone filling or its unbonded crust of masonry, must have been peculiarly susceptible to fire or battery, as indeed burnt and tumbled ruins widely suggest. To these fallible miscellanea the *muris Gallicus* was, as Caesar clearly states, the sovereign remedy. And it was no casual growth. The uniformity of this specialized pattern throughout a battle-area otherwise culturally so various suggests the inspiration and authority of one man

¹¹ *Antiquity*, xiii (1939), 67.

¹² *Ibid.*, 65.

¹³ Dehn in *Germania* xxi (1937), 78-82, 229-32.

¹⁴ Déchelette, *Manuel* iv (1927), 476-7; Wagner in *Germania* xxii (1938), 157-60.

¹⁵ Such as Gerhard Bersu found on the Wittnauer Horn in northern Switzerland—a notable example. See *Des Wittnauer Horn im Kanton Aargau* (Basel, 1945), pl. XVIII, 71.

or at any rate of one planning-committee, and Vercingetorix and his staff are the obvious candidates. I do not, however, press or further




FIG. 2. FRAGMENT OF A TYPICAL *murus Gallicus* IN BRITTANY, SHOWING NAILED TIMBERING AND PIERCED STONE REVETMENT

discuss that possibility in the present context. I prefer to pause a moment to say something of our general approach to problems of this kind.

Of the primary nature of that approach I have no doubt. These hill-forts are, as Leland had it, the works of 'men of warre', and we must think of them first and foremost in that sense if we would comprehend them. They challenge us to-day, and we must answer them with a challenge. You remember well of course those resounding words about the Battle of Chevy Chase: 'Certainly I must confesse mine own barbarousnesse, I never heard the old Song of Percy and Duglas, that I founde not my heart mooved more than with a Trumpet.' There spoke no timid professor of English literature, but Sir Philip Sidney with his armour about him and poesie in his scabbard. And similarly and most certainly let us confess unashamedly, whether we be professors or not, a proper military barbarousness in the presence of these impending earthworks, so be it that they move us with their embattled purpose for the old warriors that they are, and dissolve not too quickly, as they sometimes incline to do, into culture-creeps and ceramic crosswords. Let us be Philip Sidneys in this matter—and I say this, I trust, as a scientist, not as a sentimentalist. Let us not for a moment forget that these fortifications are urgent things, dynamic reactions, possessing the anxious effort of men from age to age in a foredoomed struggle to keep pace technically and tactically with the changing art of attack. They have, often enough, little to do inherently with the less instant and more local vagaries of brooches and crockery, with the petty wanderings of tribesmen or traffickers.

I would emphasize this essential *separateness* of military and domestic culture, for it is important to our theme. That separateness should not indeed be difficult for us to appreciate. As I write, our daily papers are full of simple Korean peasants manipulating the most advanced types of Western tanks and guns, and indeed employing with adequate skill (not entirely, it is to be supposed, under alien direction) the most modern tactics of war. And it is fair enough if we ascribe something of the same duality of 'culture' to our Early Iron Age forerunners. How a man made a pot or what he drank from it had no necessary integration with the fashion in which he attacked his neighbour or sought to prevent his neighbour's retaliation. It need be no surprise to us that somewhere half way up the Welsh border certain types of pottery peter out whilst certain types of fortification go marching on,¹⁸ or that in France the *muris Gallicus* straddles a variety of domestic cultures. Why not?

It is a truism that defence, earthwork or other, can only be understood in terms of attack. What methods of attack obtained in the latter part of the Early Iron Age in north-western Europe? There would appear to have been roughly four: the sword and spear, the bow, the sling, and the battering-ram and sap. Of these, there is good enough evidence

¹⁸ 'Culture has been left behind; warriors are on the march accompanied by such camp-followers as could tolerate an uncivilized

existence.'—Lily F. Chitty, *Arch. Camb.*, xcii (1937), 135.

of the sword and spear, though they may in Britain at any rate have been mainly weapons of the aristocracy. For the bow, the evidence is relatively slight from the Middle Bronze Age onwards. Pre-Roman arrowheads of the Iron Age are rare, and it is guesswork to assume bone points (although these have been conjecturally identified) or fire-hardened wooden ones. The catapult was not pre-Roman. Slingstones, whether of clay or merely selected 2-ounce pebbles, are notably numerous in certain multivallate camps in the west of England (e.g. Maiden Castle, Dorset, and Bredon-on-the-Hill, Worcestershire), and I have found them in multivallate camps in southern Brittany. I shall say more about them in a few moments. The battering-ram was specifically a Roman siege-device, as was the sapping of a wall by tunnelling. They both imply an organization and discipline that were foreign to the Celtic levy. This incidentally is an additional reason for ascribing the closely-knit anti-ram *muris Gallicis* to the period of impact with the discipline of Rome.

Of these methods of attack, the somewhat hypothetical bow and the indubitable sling imply long-range combat, whilst the sword, spear and ram imply in-fighting. The former (the sling) might therefore be expected to encourage widespread defences in depth, the latter (the sword and ram) strong wall-like defences at close-quarters. And such, let it be said at once, is the present trend of the evidence. I have sufficiently pointed out elsewhere that the sling as a mass-weapon seems to have been characteristic of parts of north-western France and south-western Britain where multivallate camps occur in the last two centuries B.C.; in contradistinction to the sword, etc., which were characteristic of the univallate (occasionally bivallate) Hallstatt-Early La Tène tradition on the one hand and of the Roman army on the other (save perhaps when operating against slingers or the headlong charge of a Highland clan).

A further word about the sling. Its classic home was in the Balearic Islands of the western Mediterranean, but it certainly extended to the Venetic traders of southern Brittany. Two reasons may be suggested for its popularity amongst a seafaring folk. First, many beaches offer an unending supply of ready-made slingstones in the form of beach-pebbles. Secondly, for a running fight at sea the slingstone was at that time the most convenient and economical missile. We have indeed an implicit hint of the naval tactics of such folk in Caesar's description of the fateful sea-battle between his troops and the Veneti off the south Breton coast in 56 B.C. It will be recalled that the Veneti, living along the sea-cliffs of Brittany and traditionally occupied in overseas trade, notably with Britain, took to their sailing-ships before Caesar's advance, and their tip-and-run tactics were on the point of success when a sudden calm enabled the legionaries in their heavy galleys to grapple, and fight what was in effect a heavy-infantry land-battle on shipboard—close fighting of a kind with which the Veneti were not competent to deal.

The sling is not actually mentioned but fits convincingly into the picture of Venetic tactics and disabilities. Moreover, a careful survey of northern France in 1938-9 showed that only in southern Brittany, on headland sites precisely of the kind that Caesar ascribes to the Veneti of those parts, is there a group of multivallate camps such as the sling implies: camps identical with the headland camps of the Cornish peninsula, goal of Venetic trade and probably first landfall of the multivallate idea in Britain.¹⁷

By contrast, the *murus Gallicus*, although occasionally associated in France with an outer line or lines, was normally the defence of a univallate camp. At Le Petit Celland and Huelgoat there are partial secondary ditches, but of relatively insignificant size, sufficient perhaps to delay the approach of a battering-ram in the first onslaught, but not comparable to the multiple defences of the Venetic headland forts, still less to those of western Britain. The *murus Gallicus* was essentially the grand-stand for close-range fighting, for spearing the attacker, for cutting him down from scaling ladders, or for hurling down rocks upon him, after the manner of the beleaguered Dacians on Trajan's column.

But our picture of Gallic fortification in the Caesarian period does not end there. In addition to the multivallate camps of the Veneti and the *murus Gallicus* which I have ascribed to the All-Gallia staff of Vercingetorix, field-work in 1939 revealed a third class in the Belgic area where, as I have already observed, the All-Gallic writ scarcely ran. The Belgae were independent folk, who did things in their own way, whether in the withstanding of Cimbric invaders or in the development of Ultimate Marnian pottery or, as we now know, in the designing of large and formidable camps. My Normandy expedition identified ten of these distinctive camps before its work was interrupted at a few hours' notice by the Second German War.¹⁸ They lie along and north-east of the Seine valley, roughly in the Dieppe region, and are marked by a single high earthen rampart, a broad, very shallow, canal-like ditch, and an inturned entrance. I dug into two of them—at Fécamp on the Channel-coast and at Duclair on the Seine—and verified both their structure and their date, which overlaps the intrusion of Roman things into this region about the middle of the 1st century B.C. And by a coincidence, Mr. J. B. Ward Perkins at the same time found an exactly similar work of about the Claudian period at Oldbury in Kent—another Belgo-Roman overlap, though nearly a century later in actual date.¹⁹ It will be of interest, when opportunity can be made, to ascertain the remaining distribution of the Normandy series.

And now, with this tolerably massive preparation behind me I turn back to Britain. There our first task is to clear away some of the dead wood and jungle that have gradually accumulated round the problem.

¹⁷ *Antiquity*, xiii (1939), 70ff.
¹⁸ *Ant. Journ.*, xxi (1941), 267.

¹⁹ *Archaeologia*, xc (1944), 137.

First, there is the well-known question of the vitrified or calcined forts, of which there are nearly 60 in Scotland, 3 in Wales, and a doubtful one in England, whilst on the continent they extend from Brittany to Austria and Hungary. It is accepted now that the vitrification or calcination is due to the burning of a timber-laced stone wall by accident or by enemy action. It has further been affirmed, however, that 'vitrified walls . . . are just Gallic walls that have been destroyed by fire.' That is a challenging statement. But what are the facts? In solemn truth, I can find no single definite example anywhere of the vitrification of a *muris Gallicus* as defined by Caesar, except for one very interesting approximation built and burnt in 1937 by Professor Gordon Childe and Mr. Wallace Thorneycroft.²⁰ Whilst fully appreciating the value of that entertaining experiment as a complete explanation of the vitrification of stone-and-timber walls in general—a conclusion of great value—I hesitate to accept its evidence as applicable to *muri Gallici* in particular. Old fireclay bricks such as were used for the facing of the experimental wall are super-excellent retainers of heat; the timbering was set rather more closely together than is usual, so far as I can ascertain, in French *muri Gallici*; the lowest course of transverse timbers was actually continuous, without isolating masonry; and the whole work was inevitably fresh and loose and was open to the winds that blow on all sides. The resulting vitrification of the rubble core, when the whole thing was set on fire, was thus the product of special and favourable conditions. On the other hand, I may recall once more Caesar's specific statement that in the construction of a *muris Gallicus* proper the layers of timber were carefully isolated by earth and stones, and that this construction 'ab incendio . . . defendit'. If we are now, in the face of that clear statement, to suppose that the majority of the *muri Gallici* known to us have in fact been burnt to a cinder, then we can only infer either that Vercingetorix was a fool or that Caesar was a liar. Must we address the *muris Gallicus* with the words of Cleopatra 'O, couldst thou speak, that I might hear thee call great Caesar ass'? Surely, in all fairness to both Vercingetorix and Caesar we must suppose that, whilst timber and stone were indeed the elements in vitrification, it is *a priori* more likely than not that, in a majority of instances where this phenomenon occurs, they were utilized in some fashion *other* than that characteristic of the *muri Gallici* proper. We do not, to tell the truth, know what the exact original construction of *any* of our British vitrified ramparts was. In France, Déchelette observed that the clamps which are a feature of the *muris Gallicus* were seemingly absent from all the vitrified forts that had been examined.²¹ The camp of l'Impérial, at Luzech (Lot), showed in Viré's section an original Hallstatt rampart with a calcined core and a later unburnt *muris Gallicus* of La Tène II–III built outside

²⁰ *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.*, lxxii (1937–8), 44ff.

²¹ *Mannet*, ii, 2 (1913), 710.

it and in its spill,²² a sequence which probably indicates, without proving, that the calcined rampart was not a *murus Gallicus*. Whilst, therefore, it cannot be maintained that no vitrified or calcined ramparts were originally *muri Gallici*, it is, I submit, quite improper on the present evidence to group them positively with *muri Gallici* in any consideration of the cultural or chronological factors involved. Much recent discussion has been vitiated by this unwarranted grouping. In saying this, let me make it clear that I am not denying the possibility of a certain historic unity amongst vitrified forts. On the contrary. Their wide and interconnected distribution in northern and north-western Britain does in fact suggest some major historical episode. The campaigns of Agricola have been adduced by Professor Childe,²³ and I am strongly inclined to agree with him. It would not be surprising, though it is far from proof, to find that in many cases vitrification was the result of a co-ordinated slighting under conditions so widely extended that only the Roman raj is likely to have provided them. Indeed, we have to wait until the Cromwellian era for a second slighting on this vast scale.

At present, however, it is only fair to say that a vitrified rampart was originally a timber, (earth) and stone construction of one or other of the many composite types which occur in and after the Hallstatt period; but that, since the *murus Gallicus* was an improved variant of that Hallstatt tradition, designed especially to counter fire (and battery), it must be excluded from the vitrified class unless and until evidence directs otherwise.

That is a negative point; now for a more positive one arising out of another *murus Gallicus* problem in recent years. The term has been applied casually and improperly to a number of ramparts which unquestionably do not conform with Caesar's definition in significant respects. The timber-laced ramparts of Eddisbury and Bickerton in Cheshire and Almondbury in Yorkshire may in some degree have been influenced by the *murus Gallicus* (though this must not be assumed), but are certainly not *muri Gallici* as they stand. Yet they are constantly acclaimed as such. So too is Corley camp in Warwickshire, though all the evidence relating to this camp is exceedingly vague. Lastly, we have at Edgerston in Roxburghshire a very unlikely claimant for inclusion. In all these examples are one or more essential features or omissions which differentiate them from the Caesarian archetype: vertical timbers, completely at variance with the 'anti-fire' design of the *murus Gallicus*; transverse timbers that do not penetrate and hold the outer stone face against battery; absence of longitudinal anti-ram timbers, or an apparent absence of fastenings such as iron nails between transverse and longitudinal timbers where present. To overlook or underrate differentiae such as these is to smear the evidence, to rob it of exactness; not to put too fine

²² *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française*, ix (1912), 665-9; x (1913), 265, 333 and 687-711; xx (1923), 51-76.

²³ *Prehist. Communities of the British Isles* (London, 1947), p. 216.

a point on the matter, it is an offence to scholarship. I plead for a tightening-up of our terminology and our analysis : our maps are becoming clouded with *suggestiones falsi*.

There is in fact, as at present known, in Britain only one indubitable *muris Gallicus* : the famous example, now mostly destroyed, at Burghead in Morayshire. Here the timbers were nailed together in proper fashion, and the only aberrant (though not unparalleled) feature was the use of *dressed* freestone for the outer face.²⁴ There are, however, between and about the Firths of Tay and Forth on the eastern side of Scotland six other well-known camps which, whilst not coinciding with the Caesarian definition, approximate sufficiently to it to suggest a *muris Gallicus* ancestry. They are Abernethy, Forgandenny and Dun Mor in Perthshire ; Finavon and Monifieth in Forfarshire ; and Glencorse in Midlothian. The tiny fort or dun at Abernethy encloses with a double line a central area only 136 ft. by 51 ft. Both ramparts are of stone with beam-holes in the outer face, but no recorded evidence either for longitudinal beams or for fastenings. The scheme, however, suggests a devolved *muris Gallicus* on a minute scale. At Forgandenny, the inner area is 229 ft. by 65 ft. and is therefore a little larger ; the defences are in part double, and beam-holes are noted both in the outside and in the inside of the inner wall, though again no longitudinal beams and no fastenings were observed. There were some traces of vitrification. Dun Mor in Glen Almond has a larger axis of 300 ft. and is recorded to show beam-sockets in its wall. The Finavon fort, again a little larger, had a timber-laced stone wall which had been partially vitrified ; but there is once more no indication of longitudinal timbers or fastenings. The camp at Monifieth has produced closely similar evidence. At Glencorse the camp has triple defences, of which the innermost was of timber-laced stonework and is without much confidence included in the present context.

Such is our rather sorry contribution of *muri Gallici* from Britain : one certain and six less certain examples from eastern Scotland and one exceedingly doubtful example from the English midlands. What of the date of this mixed bag ? Here I have no hesitation in starting from the continental evidence which I have already summarized : no continental *muris Gallicus* is known to be earlier than the first half of the 1st century B.C., and a date in the vicinity of 60 B.C., represents the fashionable moment. The Scottish group, with its suggestion of casualness and devolution, occurs in a region not notable for enterprise in hill-fort construction, and on all grounds must be regarded as directly or indirectly derived from the continental series. It is, therefore, not earlier than the first half of the 1st century B.C., and may be appreciably later. To that structural argument I would subordinate all the miserable

²⁴ The facing stones at Corley camp seem to have been roughly dressed, but, as already remarked, essential features of the *muris*

Gallicus are here uncertain. Roughly dressed stones occur in some of the French *muri Gallici*.

scraps of cultural evidence which these seven hill-forts have produced. The best of them, Burghead, has yielded a Roman melon bead and a bone hairpin. Abernethy, more exuberant, has given us a La Tène Ic bronze brooch, an Iron Age B bronze spiral finger-ring, stone lamps, a jet ring, a deer-horn handle, much-corroded iron objects, two portions of wooden vessels, four fragments of very coarse hand-made pottery, and two pellets of baked clay resembling slingstones. Forgandenny produced scraps of inchoate pottery, a jet ring, a whorl and whetstones. From Dun Mor nothing is recorded. From Finavon were recovered sherds of coarse cooking-pots, an iron ring, flints, spindle-whorls and a thick jet ring. At Monifieth were found an iron ring-headed pin, a bone comb, a piece of lead, a stone whorl, querns, a 'bronze armlet', an iron sword and an enamelled pin. The finds at Glencorse comprise a sherd of 'native' pottery, three saddle querns and two small stone balls, all in the make-up of the wall. The sum total is not impressive and not very informative. We know indeed very little that is definite about Scottish culture in the 1st centuries B.C.-A.D., and what little we do know suggests that the Scots themselves had then no very clear idea of the matter. If you had tackled them firmly at the time with the question 'Are you A or B or AB, and, if not, what?', I doubt, from my natal knowledge of Scotland, whether the reply would have got much further than 'Hoots'. If, undeterred, we had pressed the question of the La Tène I brooch of Abernethy, our canny Scot might have reminded us that two fellows called Hawkes and Wheeler (the *puir chieles*) had both independently carried La Tène I brooches *in the South of England* into the 1st century B.C.,²⁵ and how long they continued in use north of the Tweed is just nobody's business: until well after the middle of the century, say I, relying more upon the evidence of military engineering, which after all must have had a live problem to face, than upon the enterprise of a Highland village shop which was doubtless not over-closely in touch with Parisian or Durotrigian fashions (and *they* were backward enough). We certainly need not think of '200 B.C.' (one of the suggested dates) as an inevitable inference.

From that point onwards, if we continue the argument, we pass into unmitigated speculation. But I would, as a *jeu d'esprit*, propose a possible working analogy for the Burghead group. I have already recalled that in Kent at the time of the Claudian invasion the occupants of Oldbury refortified their camp in the grandiose manner which had, in similar circumstances, distinguished the camps of their kinsfolk in Normandy nearly a century earlier. May not the devolved *muri Gallici* of eastern Scotland represent a similarly atavistic effort there by some of the grandchildren or great-grandchildren of Caesar's opponents, at the time of the Roman invasion of the 1st century A.D.? They may alternatively, of course, have been the little fortresses of refugees from

²⁵ Hawkes in *Hants. Field Club and Arch. Soc. Proc.*, xiii (1835), 37; Wheeler, *Maiden Castle*, p. 253.

Caesarian Gaul in the previous century, though, so far as our information goes, these northern *muri* do not suggest the full flush of the Caesarian age, but rather a hangover of a somewhat later period. How the builders found their way there, whether up the east coast or up the west, we simply do not yet know. Their easterly distribution, and perhaps their bits of jet, are slightly in favour of an east-coast approach. But of one thing we must, I again urge, beware: not too hastily to use timber-laced walls of heterogeneous types in Yorkshire or Cheshire, or vitrified forts of unknown construction in Bute and the Great Glen, as a hypothetical bridge between the Burghead group and the south-west. That bridge simply *won't* bear the weight without very considerable future reinforcement.

If we may permit ourselves to generalize for a final moment on the question as a whole, in so far as Britain is concerned, it is fair to suspect that in the century following Caesar's conquest of Gaul the population of Britain was widely reinforced by refugee or intransigent elements from Gaul, mostly on a fairly small scale but all armed with the determination of despair or frustration. The Belgic Commius of about 50 B.C. is a historic instance, though I sometimes think that we are apt to exaggerate his archaeological status. In and about Dorset I have recognized Breton elements of the 1st century B.C., to be clearly distinguished from other Breton elements of earlier (pre-Caesarian) date in the extreme south-west. In Kent we have the distinctively Belgic earthwork of Oldbury, apparently an innovation from Normandy as late as the 1st century A.D. In the Trent basin Miss Kenyon has recently isolated a group of wares dating from the 1st centuries B.C. and A.D. and has ascribed a Low Country origin to it; adding that there is a notable and probably significant absence of earlier Iron Age occupation in the Midland settlement-area concerned.²⁰ And now, in another relatively empty region along the east coast of Scotland, are these other continental outliers, more or less devolved *muri Gallici* which can scarcely be earlier than Caesar and may be anything later. Even without more debatable examples such as the Glastonbury complex, which may or may not fit partly into the same series, the picture is sufficiently impressive: a picture of localized infiltration from the conquered mainland, with a natural (though not invariable) preference for the less resistant or less populated areas of the island refuge.

But enough of these *muri Gallici* and their kin. I have taken perhaps excessively long over them, and am conscious that my argument has been largely negative. Nevertheless, it serves, I hope, to illustrate and to reaffirm two of the familiar but occasionally forgotten factors which control our general problem as we see it in these remote post-Allcroft times: first, the differential development of military and domestic cultures, with its far-reaching implications, and secondly, the need for

²⁰ *Leicestershire Arch. Soc. Trans.*, xxvi (1950), 67.

precise definition, and for the strict adherence to precise definition, as a preface to distributional theory. At present we are just a little inclined (I suspect) to *muddle* along. I might add a third factor, a truism which likewise needs re-emphasis: namely, the *unity* of the problems on both sides of the English Channel. As British archaeologists, I do venture to urge that we restore the lilies to our Royal Arms. It is no good sitting here at home taking in each other's washing and murmuring 'of course we *know* that the Channel unites, not separates, England and France.' *We must do something practical about it*; must regard Brittany and Normandy and the lands eastwards as regions not merely to be visited but to be *worked in*. I have no doubt at all that our continental colleagues, properly approached, will welcome us.

And lastly do let me say, above all, that I make these observations in no didactic sense. For my own benefit, I find it helpful now and then to re-enunciate principles and standards of work. A decade's absence from the Western field has facilitated a review of the principles governing our special study, and I offer these remarks with the proper diffidence of a mere student to those whose work has not been so interrupted. In associating the name of Hadrian Allcroft with my words, I am offering them as a tribute to one who in his day and in his way did much to encourage the study of earthwork; one who was closely associated with our Institute; and one whose book is at the same time a monument and a period-piece. We can but hope that our successors will speak thus amiably and forgivingly of our own endeavours.

THE STATHUM BOOK OF HOURS; AN EXISTING MS. MENTIONED ON A 15TH-CENTURY BRASS

By A. R. DUFTY

The Stathum Book of Hours has not previously been noticed; the illumination is not of sufficiently high quality to have called for comment. The roll which it contains of those for whom soul-prayers are asked includes only Christian names, and they have not been identified and linked with a known family and no tradition of original ownership attaches to the MS.¹ It is the purpose of this paper to establish the Stathum connection, and in so doing to touch the wider interest of the endowment and practice of obits in the Middle Ages and to record the remarkable fact that the book is referred to on an existing monumental brass.

The evidences in the MS. which provide the bases for the following enquiry are three, the signature of Henry Sacheverell (+1620) at the beginning (f. 1), the notes in the calendar which refer to 1448 and 1452 as the last past and the next coming leap years (f. 2v), and the roll of Christian names, Rafe, Godith, Thomas, Elizabeth, Cecill and John, among the prayers from the Office of the Dead (Plate XIX).

Briefly described, the liturgical composition of the book is as follows.² After notes on the Calendar are the Hours of the Virgin (use of Sarum), with memorials at the end of Lauds for the Holy Ghost, Holy Cross, Trinity, (leaf missing), SS. Nicholas, Mary Magdalen, Katharine and Ursula, All Saints, and Peace, and at the end of Vespers for the Holy Ghost, Holy Cross, St. Ursula, Relics, All Saints, and Peace (ff. 3-22v). There follow Penitential Psalms and Litany (ff. 23-32v) and the Office of the Dead (ff. 33-48). The fifth section comprises prayers etc., extracted from the Office of the Dead, with the names of Rafe, Godith, Thomas, Elizabeth, Cecill and John introduced at various points (ff. 48v-53). At the end are miscellaneous prayers etc. (ff. 53-57v).³

Those for whose souls prayers are asked in the fifth section are always named in the same order, and, while this would be no more than reasonably consistent in one and the same document, the order is significant in the present context.⁴

¹ The MS. is bound in pig-skin over boards, 8 ins. by 8½ ins. The black-letter text has small initials in gold, blue and red. Seven pages have illuminated borders and initial letters, all of foliage design, and most of the remaining pages have conventional line-decoration in the left margin elaborated round the initials. Mounted on the binding are staples and split-rings for chains and two square-quatrefoil studs for closing-thongs (now missing). When the book was inherited by the writer the boards were almost entirely destroyed by woodworm; they have now been renewed.


² I am much indebted to Mr. A. Mayor of the British Museum for notes on the composition of the book.

³ Single leaves are wanting after ff. 2, 8 and 15. The text follows straight on from f. 51v to f. 32; the two stubs at this point represent cancelled, not missing, leaves.

⁴ In charters of chantry foundations and articles of endowment of obits there is no recognised order of precedence or seniority in the names of those listed for whom soul-prayers are asked; the impression gained from them is of the vaguest protocol in the matter.

The signature of Henry Sacheverell, the early 17th-century owner of the MS., is followed by a note in a different hand, '— of Morley was buried at Ratby in Leicestershire and has a monument there he died 15 June 1620'. The monument survives. This record of his connection with the Sacheverells of Morley, in Derbyshire, links him with a local family of note and one very fully commemorated in brasses and monuments in Morley church. He was the great-great-grandson of John Sacheverell, killed at Bosworth, who had married Joan, daughter and heiress of Henry Stathum, Lord of Morley, a marriage which brought the Morley estates to the Sacheverells after the Stathums had held them for more than a century.¹

The Stathum pedigree² is immediately revealing. An ancestor of Joan Stathum was named John, and it will be seen that he and his wife and the two generations preceding him are the persons, in order of seniority, named in this Book of Hours. Rafe and Godith the grandparents, Thomas and Elizabeth the parents, Cecily and John.



¹ Rev. S. Fox, *History and Antiquities of— St. Matthew, Morley* (1872), 2-7, and pedigree. J. C. Cox, *Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire* iv (1879), 325-8.

² R. Thoroton, *Antiquities of Nottinghamshire* i (1790), 98.

³ Cox, *op. cit.*, 331, referring to whether they were brothers or father and son.

Harl. Soc. iv, *Visitations of Nottingham in 1569 and 1614*, 163 (Harl. MS., 1400 and 1555). Henry is shewn as the son of Thomas and his second wife, Thomasin daughter of John Curzon of Kedleston, in Harl. MS., 1555.

Harl. Soc. xii, *Visitation of Warwick in 1619*, 392. The generations are confused. Henry is made the son of John and Cecily.



The Stathum connection here shewn, the date of the MS., 1448-1452, the survival of John Stathum to the year 1454 and, perhaps, the precedence given to Cecily in contradistinction to that accorded to the wives of the two earlier generations might suggest, were no other evidence available, that John Stathum himself had not only selected those of his family for whom prayers were to be said, but had commissioned the Book of Hours.

It is necessary then to examine any other evidence which may exist indicating the tenor of John Stathum's ways in concern for his family. The first available evidence, chronologically, is the most important to the immediate purpose. It is an agreement¹ entered into in 1453 between Thomas Breadsall,² prior of Breadsall Park,³ and John Stathum of Morley, by which the prior undertook in consideration of a gift by John⁴ that he or a canon-priest of the priory should celebrate an annual mass for the souls of Godith, Thomas, Elizabeth, Cecill and John Stathum⁵ on the feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins (Plate XX).⁶ Here are the same names, excepting Rafe, repeated in the same order, with the definite endowment of obits, which reflects direction and purpose on the roll in the Book of Hours.

Next there is the evidence of two brasses in Morley church.⁷ One is John Stathum's memorial, with himself⁸ and his wife kneeling before St. Christopher (Plate XVIII), with the English inscription recording that he 'ordained 3s. and 4d. yearly for bread, to be done in alms among poor folk of the parish in the day of the obit of dame Godith'.⁹ The other brass is of exceptional character. It lists the prayers ordained by John Stathum to be said, again for Rafe, Godith, Thomas, Elizabeth, Cecill and John (Fig. p. 88).

¹ B. M. Add. Charter 5243.

² Thomas Breadsall, prior 1442-56 (Lichfield Epis. Reg. Heyworth, t. 92b; *ibid.* Boulers, f. 32).

³ Breadsall Priory (Austin Canons).

⁴ The temporal recompense for the spiritual services was 7 marks for the roof of the priory-church and for glazing the windows.

⁵ Endowment of masses for the living was by no means exceptional. In the Register of Bishop Bekynton of Wells (entry 1568) is a grant dated 20 March, 1463-4, of an indulgence of forty days 'to all contrite and confessed persons who shall repair to the tomb of William Carent (+1476), erected and built in the prebendal church of Hengstrygge (Henstridge, Somerset) and say a *Pater Noster* and an *Ave Maria* for the good estate of the said William, and of . . . his brothers, and of John Carent the younger, his son, during their lives, and for their souls when they are dead and the soul of Margaret late the wife of the said William, deceased'. (Somerset Record Society 1934, xlix, 412.) The tomb survives and is itself of very considerable interest, retaining much original colouring with painted inscriptions. Again, the foundation deed of Daundy's chantry (*infra*) reads 'I do . . . establish a perpetual

chantry for a perpetual secular priest . . . for prosperous state of our sovereign Lord the King, his dear beloved wife Queen Catherine, and also for me the said Edmund Daundy, Thomas Wolsey, clerk, Dean of the Cathedral church of Lincoln, . . . for the time of our life, and for the souls of . . . the forsaide . . . after our decease . . .'. Many examples will be found quoted in G. H. Cook, *Mediaeval Chantries and Chantry Chapels* (1947).

⁶ The Charter is notable for the inclusion of the three collects to be used by the celebrant.

⁷ H. E. Field in *Trans. Mon. Brass. Soc.* v, 31.

⁸ In common with much in this enquiry the brass has unusual features. It shows John Stathum in armour with a deep fauld or skirt of lames of plate hung from the waist and overlapping upwards; it is corrugated to resemble the vertical folds in a textile skirt. Representations on brasses of faulds of this form are very rare; compare the brass of John Gaynesford, 1450, Crowhurst, Surrey.

⁹ This being the normal practice for procuring obits; the benefactor made payment to the parish priest who was responsible for seeing that a mass was sung on the anniversary of the death and that a proportion of the sum was distributed in alms.

John Stathum's part in these expressions of filial piety need be laboured no further, and the close connection between the second brass and the Book of Hours will be shewn in concluding this paper. It remains to consider the purpose of this brass. The suggestion has been made¹ that it is a further memorial to John Stathum, but more probably it served quite a different purpose.

It is known that parochial bede-rolls, containing the names of all benefactors for whose souls prayers were desired, were placed on the High Altar during the celebration of mass on Sundays and festivals and the names were read aloud by the priest. In 1514 an Edmund Daundy founded a perpetual chantry at the altar of St. Thomas in the church of St. Lawrence, Ipswich; the ordinance lists those for whom prayers are to be said and stipulates that their names are to be inscribed on a tablet set up openly on the altar.² Further, in the chantry chapel of SS. Anne and Thomas in the churchyard of old St. Paul's a daily mass was sung for the good estate of Henry V and the founder of the chantry, Dean Thomas Moore, for their souls and the souls of Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV and others, and all these names were to be written large on a tablet over the altar, that the worshippers might know for whom they were joining in prayer.³ From a number of brasses in Morley church it is clear that Rafe, Godith and John Stathum had made substantial contributions to the fabric fund,⁴ furthermore, the brass we are considering is placed above the piscina, south of the altar, which is considered to be the original position.⁵ It seems, therefore, that this is an obit reminder brass,⁶ being a fixed and permanent record near the altar of those for whom obits were to be kept and of the prayers to be said.⁷

When we consider the growth of the chantry system in England in the late 14th, 15th and early 16th centuries and the multiplication of obits, it is clear that even allowing for those of short duration the number of soul-masses required to be sung was immense, and from this it is reasonable to suppose that obit reminder brasses and tablets

¹ Fox, *op. cit.*; Cox, *op. cit.*

² 'I will . . . that the name of our sovereign Lord the King, the Queen, the name of the said Edmund, etc., among the quick, during our lives, and also the name of Ann, Robert, etc., among the dead on a table shall be written, and the same table by the said priest ordained openly upon the altar of St. Thomas Martyr, etc., to be set to the intent that every day the priest in his mass shall pray for the prosperity of the said sovereign Lord the King, and the said Edmund the founder, etc.' Wodderspoon's transcription, *Memorials of the Ancient Town of Ipswich* (1850), 351.

³ Licence dated Aug. 1, 1415 (Pat. Rolls, 3 Henry V). The letters patent were not executed, and a further licence was granted to Moore's executors Jan. 20, 1424 (Pat. Rolls, 2 Henry VI). Sir W. Dugdale, *History of St. Paul's*

Cathedral (1818), 93. H. H. Milman, *Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1869), 149.

⁴ Rafe Stathum 'qui istam capellam fieri fecit'. Godith Stathum 'que presentem Ecclesiam cum campanili de novo construxit'.

Godith and Richard her son 'qui campanile istud et ecclesiam fieri fecerunt'.

John Stathum 'qui bene et notabiliter huic ecclesie egit'.

John Stathum 'which yaf to yis churchc iii belles'.

⁵ Cox, *op. cit.*, 329.

⁶ The obit is not entered in the Chantries Certificate for Derbyshire, probably the sum was not large.

⁷ A small number of obit brasses and tables of allied interest survives, with the entirely distinct purpose of recording the endowment and the date and form of the obit, see page 88.

sepulchro facies in die iudicii rediſtata quidi me
 annus omni ſilicium deſiderium in ſini abra
 he patriſque tui iudex tollere. Iſta me die te mo
 te carue in die illa tremenda quid cel mouerit
 et tu diem ueris iudicem ſeculum p igitur.

For the ſolus of. Maſe. Sobriety. Thomas.

Elizabeth. Ciall. and John. and for all. and

Deprobis clama. Spirit ſolus. p

Qui aut te dicit. dicit gratia uocem meam.

Quam aures tue intendentes. in uocem de
 cationis meae. Si iniquitates obſeruationis lo
 amine. dicit quis ſuſtinebit. Quia apud te pro
 priatio eſt. et pater legem tuam ſuſtinet te dicit.

Suſtinui anima mea in iudicio tuo. Quia
 ut anima mea in domino. Audibis iudicia

na uſque ad iudicium. Quia illi in dno. Quia
 apud dnm mis. et cognosce apud eum reſpon
 ſus. Et ipſi reſponſet illi. et omnibus iniquitatibus

illis eris. Pater ut. dicit meum. Et uener. ac ſequi
 entem. Et ſub ſp. uſque illi. dicit. ſolus.

Dominus de omnipotens pater. et ſolus. et
 ſanctus. dicit. dicit. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

habet in a pater omnipotens in dicit. Quia te pater
 tes a ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.


et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.

et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus. et ſolus.



AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PRIOR OF BREADSALL PRIORY AND JOHN STATHUM
(B.M. ADD. CHARTER 5243)

were numerous before the Acts of suppression ; that they would suffer under the Acts is clear, and no doubt this explains their excessive rarity to-day.

Thus their purpose has remained unrecognised because so few have survived, and the Stathum brass may enable others, often no doubt of simpler form,¹ to be identified. The wording of the Stathum inscription, however, is probably without a parallel (Fig. p. 88).

'For the souls of Rafe, Godith, Thomas, Elizabeth, Cecill, and John and of their successors and for all Christian souls De Profundis etc., Pater Noster etc., Ave Maria, et ne nos, requiem eternam etc., Domine exaudi orationem, with this orison Inclina domine etc., John Stathum ordained this to be said and more written in other divers books.'²

Thus at the least we possess the record of a man's benefactions, this remarkable brass, and a Book of Hours with associations firmly established. If, however, the three may be linked together then their significance is very greatly increased, and we have in effect the quite remarkable preservation of the brass together with one of the books to which it refers and knowledge of the man who commissioned them.

The Book of Hours itself puts the last possibility beyond reasonable doubt, for a prayer on folio 53 reads : ' Sancta Maria regina caeli domina mundi noli me famulum tuum Johannem propter peccata despicere sed exaudi me in tua solita pietate et erue me de inimicis unigeniti filii tui et fideles tuos vivos ac defunctos a mortis caligine ipso adiuvante quem tu genuisti et in praesepe posuisti. . . . Ora pro me ad dominum amen '.

These connections between John Stathum and the MS. on the one hand and the brass on the other, in addition to the evidence already shewn, leave no doubt that the MS. is one of the books referred to on the brass. Furthermore, this identification enables a right appreciation to be made of the section of the Book of Hours between folios 48v and 53, comprising a number of prayers etc., chosen from the Office of the Dead ; it is the ' *more written* ' of the text of the brass, and in the light of this the English heading introducing the section acquires a proper significance, in addition to its charm ; it reads :

' Here is a prayer compiled in short space to pray for a soul that a man is bounden to pray for : and who that is in good life and says these prayers that follow, for the souls that are here rehearsed : he shall have great pardon and great meed also for their good intent, etc., for the souls of rafe, godith, thomas, elizabeth, cecill, and john, and also generally for all christian souls. Antiphon. Placebo. Psalmus.' (Plate XIXa.)

¹ See note page 88.

² *De Profundis*, Psalm cxxx, is from the Office of the Dead. *Ne nos* signifies the penultimate clause of the Lord's Prayer and the prayers following, after the earlier clauses have been said *in secreto*. *Requiem eternam* is the refrain 'Eternal rest : grant unto them, O Lord. And

light perpetual : shine upon them', used after every psalm and canticle in the office. *Domine exaudi orationem* is the antiphon, 'Hear, Lord, my prayer : unto Thee shall all flesh come'. The orison *Inclina domine* is the collect for the departed, use of Sarum. Compare the MS. (Plate xix). (Cox, *op. cit.*, 329.)

In conclusion, it seems curious that a Book of Hours which is a private devotional book should be fitted on the binding with rings for the attachment of chains.¹ Perhaps a pure conjecture to explain it may be allowed, that of the books commissioned by John Stathum possibly this copy was kept chained to a desk in Morley church below the brass which it supplements.²



THE STATHUM OBIT REMINDER BRASS, c. 1454

OBIT BRASSES AND TABLES

The ascription of so special a purpose to the Stathum brass is made possible by the chance existence of evidence closely concerning it; in the absence of some such evidence only careful analysis will reveal other brasses of like purpose.³ However, a small but distinct group of brasses and tablets survives of closely allied interest; these for the most part describe specifically the date and form of the obit and the endowment.

¹ Some of the pages of the MS. have been shaved and it is possible that the book has been rebound. The fact remains that it is a 15th-century binding.

² John Stathum's will is not recorded. The book also contains at the end a number of entries to do with the Sacheverell family:

f. 58v Entries of the births of Henry, Dorothy and Raphe, children of Jasinthe and Elisabeth Sacheverell, with the hour and day, 1619-24. They are buried in Morley church.

f. 59v Note concerning Henry Sacheverell, son of Joan of Morley, 'hos de se testimoniu praebuit et in posteru reliquit', 15 August, 1568 [? 1558], 'Oxon. in Aula Glocest'.

³ Two examples perhaps within this category are 'Orate specialiter pro animabus Willielmi Stokton et Roberti Colymson quondam Maier'

Civitatis Ebor' et Isabelle uxoris Eorundem Quorum animarum propicietur deus Amen' (All Saints, North Street, York, brass, 1503) and 'Orate pro animabus Matild' Kelsy and Roberti filii quorum corpora hic requiescunt' (Ricall, Yorkshire, brass, c. 1500). The form is to be distinguished, however, and the distinction is often a fine one, from the short and perfunctory calls to pray for souls, which are found inscribed on many church fabrics and fittings, e.g., in great number on Long Melford church, Suffolk. Both forms are yet again distinct from those inscriptions of purely memorial content, beginning with the call to pray 'Ora pro . . .', or similar injunction, followed by the name of the deceased and the date of death.

Their purpose no doubt was to provide a permanent record, much as benefactors' tables were hung in churches in the post-Reformation period to record charities, foundations of local schools, doles and the rest.¹ It appears that they have not been listed and the following are sufficiently noteworthy to be quoted in full.² Negatively they serve to shew the entirely distinct intention of the Stathum brass.

CORFE CASTLE, DORSET :

PARISH CHURCH OF ST. EDWARD THE MARTYR

(1) Purbeck marble tablet (29½ ins. x 16½ ins.). 'Orate pro Roberto Ry'ky' et Johanna uxore ejus et omnia puerorum et pro animabus patris matris sue et pro animabus patris et matris uxoris ejus et omnium puerorum illorum qui fieri fecerunt istam fenestram. Super hoc Robertus et Johanna desiderabant celebrandi annua unam missam in vigilia S. Johannis baptiste et hoc in superiori gradu ante magno cruce.' (15th century, reset.)³
 (2) Purbeck marble tablet (26½ ins. x 14½ ins.). 'Orate pro Roberto Ry'ky' et Johanna uxore ejus qui dederunt unam lampadem ante altare pietatis et unam vacham⁴ ad orandum pro eis et ad celebrandum quinque missas pro fratribus et sororibus ejus in V vigiliis S. Mariae.' (15th century, reset.)⁵

FINCHLEY, MIDDLESEX :

PARISH CHURCH OF ST. MARY

Brass plate (15½ ins. x 9½ ins.). 'In dei nomine Amen Anno domini 1509 primo anno Henrici octavi The 8th day of November I Thomas Sanny of the Estend of Finchley in the county of Middlesex whole of mind and like of body make my testament and last will in form following first I bequeath my soul to Almighty God to our Lady and to all the Saints in Heaven and my body to be buried in the churchyard of our Lady of Finchley item I will after the decease of my wife the house called Fordis and Stowkefield shall e'en while the world last be paid out of the foresaid house and lands forty shillings yearly to priests to sing for my soul⁶ my fathers soul my mothers soul my wife my children my kindreds souls and all Christian souls and a noble to the reparations of the said house and dispose to highways and to poor people or in other good deeds of charity and also I will that the church wardens shall yearly see this done for ever. Item I will that this be graven in a stone of marble that all men may know it as in my will more plainly doth appear etc. Jesu Mercy Lady help.'⁶

SHIPTON-UNDER-WYCHWOOD, OXFORDSHIRE :

PARISH CHURCH OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN

Brass plate (22½ ins. x 19 ins.), palimpsest.⁷ *Reverse* : 'To all true faithfull and Christian people which shall see here behold or read this present writing John Stone and Alice his wife send greeting in our Lord everlasting. Be it known by your university that

¹ See the concluding sentence of Thomas Sanny's brass at Finchley (*infra*).

² The Latin texts have been extended, the English texts extended and most of the spelling modernised.

³ *Proc. Dorset Nat. Hist. and Arch. Soc.*, lxix, (Plates vii and viii.)

⁴ The following extracts from wills are explanatory :

To the church of Ryarsh, in the hands of the wardens, livestock, 'the farms, and the profits to be bestowid in this wise : viiid of hit by yere to fynde a lampe afore the sacrament in the channseil of Reyersche forever, and liiid of it to set me and my boye Walter in the bedroll for ever and the residue of it to the furtherance

of the churche to mayntene the stokk'—Sir Henry Watkyn, vicar, 1514. (Rochester Consistory Court Reg. vii, 9. L. L. Duncan, *Testamenta Cantiana*, W. Kent, 66.)

To the parish church of West Peckham a similar gift 'to fynde a yersmynde with placebo and dirige and masse of requiem and to pray for me and for Mawde my wife in bede roll'—John William, 1501. (Rochester, *ibid.*, v, 413. Duncan, *ibid.*, 58.)

⁵ Recite soul-masses.

⁶ Soc. Ants. Colln. rubbings. R. H. D'Eilboux in *Antiq. Journ.*, xxix, 188.

⁷ Mr. G. H. Cook kindly drew my attention to this brass.

we have given granted and confirmed by charter and seizin thereof delivered to the wardens or masters of the guild or of the brotherhood otherwise called the Fraternity of the Glorious Virgin St. Mary, Our Lady of Aylesbury, a messuage with the appurtenances lying in the parson's [fee] in Aylesbury in manner form and condition here following, that is to say that if the said masters themselves or by their attorneys whatsoever they be in the prebendal church of this blessed Mary, Our Lady of Aylesbury, after the manner and usage of the church of Salisbury solemnly to be kept sing for the souls of the said John and Alice his wife diriges yearly the 23 day of April in time to come and always to endure and on the morrow the masses in like wise then [they] to enjoy the said messuage with this also that [they] give unto the vicar of the said church yearly for the time being 8d. and distribute to other priests and clerks singing the masses 2d yearly at the place and days aforesaid and moreover if the said masters or attorneys which for the time shall be to supervise or oversee the promises take for the labours 2d that then the foresaid messuage with the appurtenances wholly remain to the said masters and their successors for evermore, and if default be made in the promises or in any of them at any day or on the morrow after any of these days or of any of the morrows aforesaid in which as it is promised it ought to be done and kept that then the foresaid John and Alice his wife aforesaid will and grant that the wardens or the masters of the said parish church of Aylesbury which for the time shall be take into their hands all the foresaid messuage [with the] appurtenances and that they receive seizin in the same to find the diriges and masses in manner and form within written [and that] they and their successors in the office of the said church do continually the same by times evermore to endure'. (Grant 1494.)¹

In this paper some attempt has been made to distinguish between obit reminders and obit records, and again between them and ordinary memorial inscriptions. The evidence is discussed generally in relation to brasses, because brasses are adequately recorded. Given a corpus of inscribed tablets, there is no reason to suppose that they would not illustrate the case independently; indeed, two of the more interesting quotations of obit records above are from inscribed tablets.

¹ Mill Stephenson, *List of Palimpsest Brasses in Great Britain* (1903), 150. The date of the obverse of the brass, 1548, is of interest in relation to the thesis put forward on page 87; it shows the re-use of an obit brass after the Chantry Acts of 1545 and 1547. Probably the

palimpsest brass at Dummer, Hampshire, of Robert Clerk 'quondam capellanus cantaris', re-used in 1591, has a similar history. (C. J. P. Cave, *List of Hampshire Brasses*, in *Trans. Mon. Brass Soc.*)

ENGLISH CLOISTER LAVATORIES AS INDEPENDENT STRUCTURES

By WALTER H. GODFREY

Provision for the washing of hands before and after meals in monastic houses was made as near as was convenient to the entrance to the Frater. In this country these lavatories, although often beautifully designed and enriched, are usually found planned in a simple manner against the walls of the cloister and frequently in recesses formed to receive them. In a few instances, however, mostly of an early date, an independent building stood within the cloister garth, the basin or fountain forming its central feature beneath a vaulted roof. This type was much more common on the continent of Europe, particularly in houses of the Cistercian Order, and very elaborate examples are found in Spain and Portugal.¹ Their rarity in England adds to their interest, and since the references to them are somewhat dispersed it seems desirable that what is now known of them should be brought together. There is something always attractive in the design of buildings raised on regular geometrical plans, whether circular, square or polygonal. The Carolingian Rotunda of Aachen and its derivatives, the Templars' Churches, the Baptistries, our English Chapter Houses, as well as Market Crosses and Conduits, furnish examples on widely differing scales. Their structure as well as their decorative features obey the governing impulse that springs from the centre, and where the pivot is functional, as with a cross, a font or a laver the opportunity for aesthetic expression is enhanced. That is probably why we find more costly material used in these lavatories and a greater indulgence in ornament.²

The description of the lavatory at Durham, which has been so often quoted from the *Rites of Durham*, is too important to be omitted here, although it must be remembered that it is of a comparatively late example (built on the site of an earlier one) described some fifty years or more after the suppression. The account³ reads: 'Within y^e cloyster garth over against y^e fraterhouse dour was a fair laver or counditt for y^e mouncks to washe ther hands and faces at, being maid in forme Round covered wth lead and all marble saving y^e [verie] uttermost walls. Wthin y^e wth walls yo^e may walke rownd about y^e laver of marble having many little Cunditts or spouts of brasse wth xxiiij^o Cockes of brasse Rownd about yt, havinge in yt vij^o faire wyndowes of stone woorke, and in the Top of it a faire dove-cotte, covered fynly over above wth lead, the workmanship both fyne and costly as is

¹ Sir William St. John Hope and Sir Harold Brakspear comment on the fact that 'no example [of the independent lavatory] has come to light in any Cistercian Abbey in England'. *Arch. Journ.* lxxiii, 129-186.

² We should not perhaps exclude the con-

sideration that their constant use may have dictated a more durable material, though it should have hardly conduced towards ornateness.

³ *Surtees Soc.*, cvii (1802), 82-3.

appar'nt till this daie. And adioyninge to y^e est syde of the counditt dour, ther did hing a bell to geve warning, at a leaven of y^e clock, for y^e mouncks to cumme wash and dyne, having ther closetts or almeries on either syde of the frater house dour kept alwaies wth swete and clene towels as is aforesaid to drie ther hands'. This description is remarkable in the vivid picture which its few telling sentences convey and the atmosphere which it preserves. The scene survives, in part, at least, at Gloucester where, though not circular or polygonal, the monks' lavatory does project into the cloister garth, and its four vaulted bays are entered by a series of arches from the cloister walk.¹

There are four examples of the independent lavatory building all dating from the latter part of the 12th century which may have some relation to one another. They occur at the Conqueror's foundation at Battle, at the nearby Cluniac house of Lewes, at another Cluniac house at Much Wenlock, and at the small Benedictine priory of St. Nicholas, Exeter, which was given to Battle Abbey at the latter's foundation. Lewes, which was head of the English province, was dependent on Cluny and Wenlock on La Charité, both of which parent monasteries had these independent types of cloister lavatories.²

Dr. Rose Graham reminds us that 'in the last years of Abbot Walter's life he pulled down the cloister [at Battle] built in the reign of William the Conqueror by Abbot Gausbert, because it was too humble and he built another of marble slabs and columns of smooth and polished workmanship. When the cloister was finished he intended to build a lavatory of the same material and workmanship, and he had engaged the workmen when he died in 1172, and although he was unable to finish it he left the money for this purpose'.³ When Sir Harold Brakspear excavated the Abbey site he found only slight traces of the foundations of the lavatory in the south-west angle of the cloister garth, these being insufficient to determine its shape.⁴ In the case of the other three we are more fortunate, Lewes and Exeter being both circular and Much Wenlock the more usual octagon. It seems likely that Exeter followed its parent house which may also have been round in plan.

These circular buildings have many points of great interest. That at Exeter, described by Sir Harold Brakspear,⁵ was carried by twin-shafts, on a circular dwarf wall, with an external diameter of 14 feet and, internally, of a little over 11 feet (Fig. 1, 5). The double capitals and bases, of Purbeck marble, have happily been for the most part preserved and are slightly wedge-shaped to accommodate an inner and outer circle of

¹ Similar projecting lavatories of late date were at Malmesbury, and Christchurch, Canterbury. Sir Harold Brakspear excavated another (11 x 5½ feet) in the Infirmary Cloister of Waverley Abbey. See his account of the Abbey published by the Surrey Archaeological Society, p. 64.

² For Cluny see *millénaire de Cluny* (Académie de Mâcon), p. 236, from a description in 1623,

and for La Charité, see P. Beaussart, *La Charité-sur-Loire*, plan facing p. 280. The lavatory was demolished in 1579.

³ Rose Graham, *English Ecclesiastical Studies* (1929), p. 197, quoting from *Chronicon de Bello*, p. 136.

⁴ *Viet. County History, Sussex* ix, p. 103.

⁵ Society of Antiquaries, *Proceedings* xxviii (1916), 345-250.




FIG. 1. COMPARATIVE PLANS OF MONASTIC LAVATORIES

shafts, the latter being of greater diameter than the former. The circle is set out in twelve parts, two of which are occupied by the entrance from the cloister. Sir Harold notes that the masons set out the bases and capitals, not as one would expect with their sides radially from the centre, but with a sharper diminution from out to inside, by which device they made the inner and outer arches of the arcade approximately the same width.

At Lewes the lavatory appears to have been surrounded by double columns, with bases and capitals worked in one stone like those at Exeter, but those in the outer and inner rings were of equal diameter (Fig. 1(8)). The building was naturally larger and within its circular containing wall it measured 19 feet in diameter.¹ The material was apparently black marble, now grey by exposure. Two of the double bases of the arcade are preserved (one in a number of carved stones built into the reredorter wall), and it seems probable that there was an arcade of twin arches, as at Much Wenlock (see below), but with the shafts closer together, and that the piers between were wedge-shaped to allow of the circular form. Fragments of larger shafts may belong to the inner parts of these piers. There are a number of single bases of the same material but no capitals have survived. We can, however, I think, be certain that the portions of marble shafts carved with spiral mouldings of various sections (Plate XXIB) are parts of the structure and the variety of the fragments point to considerable elaboration. More important even than these is a precious section of the central basin or laver, which has carved upon it a shaft with cushion capital and the springing of two of the arches of a continuous arcade with vine and grape ornament in the spandrel² (Plate XXIA). The stone is curved in plan and is part of a circle some 10 or 11 feet in diameter. It is 2 feet 8 inches high and about 6 inches thick, and the upper rim is obviously that of a basin which has been worn in use.

Beneath this circular laver was a well,³ domed over beneath the cloister level, and the upper part of this can still be approached by the original vaulted passage that led from the frater undercroft. The details of the laver indicate that the Lewes lavatory was somewhat earlier in date than those at Battle and Exeter.

The lavatory at Much Wenlock has more surviving remains than the others, but its stones have been re-set in such a way as to make it difficult to visualize its precise form. It seems clear, however, that the main structure was octagonal with an internal diameter of just over 20 feet. In the plan published by Dr. D. H. S. Cranage in his account of the buildings, he shows the lavatory as a complete octagon unattached

¹ Sir William St. John Hope in *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, xlix (1906), 73.

² The late Sir Alfred Clapham instantly identified this fragment of the laver when he visited Lewes with me many years ago. It was not until later that I found it had already

been figured and identified in *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, vi, 259, in 1853.


³ There is a well in the same position at Reading Abbey which may point to a similar earlier lavatory.



A. LEWES PRIORY: FRAGMENT OF LAVEE B. LEWES PRIORY: SHAFTS OF LAVATORY
(Photos: National Buildings Record)



C. MUCH WENLOCK ABBEY: PANELS FROM THE LAVATORY
(Photos: F. H. Crossley)



A. CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY :
WATER TOWER
(Photo: National Buildings Record)



B. LAVATORY AT THE CISTERCIAN MONASTERY OF ALCANICES,
PORTUGAL
(Photo: A. H. Blakes)

to the claustral walk¹ (Fig. 1, 7). The angles of the building have buttressed piers, and each side has twin arches carried by three double shafts, those of each pair being a further distance apart than at Lewes. The remains of the central basin shew that the work was elaborate in the highest degree, and the material was fine hard Wenlock limestone or marble, very different, Dr. Cranage remarks, from the sandstone facing used in the main buildings. Two arched panels carved with figure subjects survive from what was evidently the circular base of the fountain. One has twin arches within an enclosing reeded arch, with two figures. The other has a trefoil arch over a group of figures with boats (Plate XXIc). Above these are now fixed some lengths of remarkably rich ornament based on a combination of anthemion, scroll and shell, which are reminiscent of the band of ornament beneath the figures on the font at St. Nicholas, Brighton. It seems, however, likely that this carving which is beautifully preserved, surrounded the upper basin, above the washing-trough. There are other even more elaborate pieces of carving, and the whole medley awaits careful investigation. What is certain is that this little building and its fountain must have been a gem of Romanesque design and workmanship.

When Sir William St. John Hope excavated the site of the Durham lavatory he uncovered the foundations of its 12th-century predecessor.² This was square in plan, being 15 feet across inside the walls, and had a circular laver (Fig. 1, 1). It was in the angle of the old cloister and attached to its south and west walls. Viollet le Duc illustrates a square lavatory at Fontenay³ (Fig. 1, 4). Each side (which was just over 20 feet long inside) was divided into two bays, having double arches supported on three sets of twin shafts as at Much Wenlock. A central shaft penetrated the fountain, and the whole was vaulted in four compartments. The later lavatory at Durham appears to have been circular within, but octagonal with angle buttresses outside.⁴ Its internal diameter was approximately 20 feet (Fig. 1, 2). Although there are no remains of the structure St. John Hope gives cogent reasons for giving it an early 13th-century date. In 1432-3 it was provided with a new basin of Eggleston marble, the accounts for which are extant. This basin is preserved in the centre of the cloister garth, and provides interesting evidence of the way the laver was fashioned. It is octagonal in plan, the upper basin being a single stone 7 feet across, hollowed out to a depth of 8 inches. Beneath it projects an encircling trough rather more than a foot wide. The base and superstructure are both missing, and the only ornament consists of a row of shields surrounding the basin itself.

The supply of water to these lavatories is made clear by the well-known 12th-century plan of Christ Church, Canterbury. This shews

¹ *Archaeologia*, lxxii (1921-2), 115. Sir Harold Brakspear also gives a plan in *Soc. of Antiq. Proceedings* xxviii, 248, but shows it attached to the cloister wall.

² See plan, *Archaeologia* lviii (1903), Plate xxxv.

³ *Dictionnaire Raisoné de l'Architecture* (1875), vi, p. 172. See also Marcel Aubert, *L'architecture Cistercienne en France* (1947), ii, 24-31, for 'les pavillons de la fontaine' at Fontenay and Le Thoronet.

⁴ *Op. cit.* *Archaeologia*, Plate xxxvii.

a large roofed lavatory in the Great Cloister and two in the Infirmary Cloister. Each shews a multi-foil basin, and another appears at the entrance to the north Hall. Fortunately one of these buildings still remains in the Infirmary Court, circular in plan, with a central cluster of columns supporting a vault¹ (Figs. 1, 3 and Plate XXIIA). This one had an upper storey to accommodate the cistern which gave the required head of water for the general supply. There must have been sufficient pressure to bring the water to the level of the lavatory basins and elsewhere, although a fall by gravity from the 'head-conduit' to which the water was pumped was utilized wherever practicable. It should be possible to supplement the information in the Canterbury plan by a careful study of buildings like those of Lewes Priory, where there is extensive evidence of a water supply and of the points where it was utilized. St. John Hope has some interesting remarks concerning the pipes and channels found in the Durham cloister which he interprets in the light of the Canterbury plan. It seems to have been the custom to keep the water continually flowing as described by Dom Martin Marrier, in 1637, at St. Martin des Champs Paris, where the stream of water issued from the bronze figure of St. Martin on horseback into a basin holding one hundred and seventy gallons.

The actual form of the various lavatories or conduits at Canterbury cannot be determined from the plan which shews each building in a simple outline which could be either square or round or even multangular. Viollet le Duc gives an interesting early vaulted example at the Cistercian house of Le Thoronet which is a hexagon, and this is the shape of the lavatory excavated at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury.² A considerable part of the 13th-century octagonal lavatory remains at the Irish Cistercian Abbey of Mellifront, a plan of which Brakspear gives in connexion with his notes on St. Nicholas, Exeter³ (Fig. 1, 9). This is vaulted with a central column, and carried a cistern above it. Dunbrody Abbey, of the same order in Ireland, had a circular lavatory projecting from the south walk of the cloister.⁴ The Cistercian Abbeys of Melrose and Dundrennan in Scotland possessed rectangular lavatories projecting from the north and south walks respectively.⁵

At Durham, it is stated in the *Rites* that the lavatory was surmounted by a dove-cote, and St. John Hope surmises from this that it had a wooden roof, which he thinks was a later addition. Medieval dove-cotes were, however, substantial affairs, and the Durham lavatory may well have been vaulted with an upper storey, either designed for or converted into a dove-cote.

¹ This central support has suffered alteration from time to time. It was probably designed as a circular pier, enclosing the pipes, and having attached shafts to take the vaulting ribs. Four of these shafts, with carved capitals, remain. Basins for washing may have surrounded the pier.

² See plan, *Arch. Journ.* lxxxvi (1930), opposite p. 277.

³ *Op. cit.* Soc. of Antiquaries Proceedings.

See also 'The Cistercian Order in Ireland,' by Prof. Hamilton Thompson, Sir Alfred Clapham and H. G. Leask, *Arch. Journ.* lxxxviii (1931), plan opposite p. 12, photographs opposite pp. 9 and 354.

⁴ It was 16 feet in diameter; see plan *Arch. Journ.* lxxxviii, opposite p. 28.

⁵ For plans see Ministry of Works' *Guide to Melrose and Arch. Journ.* xcvi (1939), opposite p. 327.

The independently built lavatory, many examples of which may have disappeared,¹ seems to have been superseded by the long wall or trough lavatory after the beginning of the 13th century. One quite late example, however, survives at Sherborne. This is hexagonal in plan, with buttresses at the angles and a plain parapet (Fig. 1, 6). It was built by Abbot Albert Mere (1504-35) and was attached to the north cloister walk opposite the frater. It was removed by Sir John Horsey, after the dissolution, and was re-erected in Cheap Street, Sherborne, where the original entrance now faces west. The other faces had windows from which the mullions and the walling below have been removed. The interior has a ribbed lierne vault springing from angle-shafts and at the inter-sections are foliage bosses, with a large central boss having the arms of the Abbey on a shield with angel supporters.²

Some echoes of these monastic lavatories can be recognized in such fountains as that erected in the great court of Linlithgow Palace³ by James V of Scotland, and the renaissance fountain in the centre of Trinity College, Cambridge, which was constructed 1601-1615. The latter is still fed by the conduit laid by the House of Grey Friars (now Sidney Sussex College) *c.* 1434, permission for the use of which was granted to King's Hall in 1441 and confirmed by Henry VIII at the dissolution of the Friary.⁴ It is probably the only monastic water service still employed for its original purpose in England.

The examples in Portugal at Batalha and Alcobaça (Plate XXII B) show what richness could be achieved in these remarkable buildings, which, although designed for the most utilitarian purpose, were exalted by the artist into exquisite creations of the mason's craft.

¹ A part of a large basin was discovered at Peterborough and fragments of spiral marble shafts, which closely resemble those at Lewes, are preserved in the Museum in the monastic kitchen at Glastonbury.

² Information kindly supplied by Mr. A. R. Dufty. For several of the above references I am

indebted to Dr. Rose Graham.

³ J. S. Richardson and James Boveridge, *The Palace of Linlithgow* (1934), plate opposite p. 14.

⁴ Willis and Clark, *Architectural History of the University of Cambridge* (1886), II, 427-430, 627-630.

WILLIAM ALNWICK, BISHOP OF LINCOLN

By A. HAMILTON THOMPSON

Of recent years there has been a considerable development of interest in those records of ecclesiastical administration which are preserved in the registries of bishops and deans and chapters throughout this country, and some progress has been made in the editing and publication, not only of episcopal registers, the most important class of this kind, but of subsidiary documents of various types which add to our knowledge of diocesan arrangements. It is the purpose of this paper to give an account, derived from such sources, of the activities of a bishop, the surviving records of whose episcopate I have studied with some care. A certain amount of what I have to say has already appeared in print in the course of an introduction to some of those records; but I have combined this with other material for my present purpose. Further, since I began to study the career of William Alnwick, I have had the opportunity of comparing it at close quarters with that of many prelates who were his contemporaries, seen through a similar medium.

We know nothing of William of Alnwick's origin except that he was born at or near Alnwick, probably between the years 1380 and 1390. It has been stated, without the least foundation, that he was a brother of Henry, second earl of Northumberland, and therefore a son of Hotspur. No such august claim can be made for him. It is probable that, like many other medieval clerks, he was the son of a local merchant or farmer. We know from his will that he had a brother, whose daughter Agnes married a man called Richard Hayton and was a widow with a young daughter in 1445. Otherwise, all we know is that he was one of many Williams who came from Alnwick and were known by no other surname than that of their birthplace. Unfortunately there has been a tendency among historians to identify him with every William Alnwick of whom record remains. In the Dictionary of National Biography you will find the circumstantial story that he was a monk of St. Alban's abbey who, in 1420, became prior of the small dependent house of Wymondham in Norfolk, and almost immediately, by a transition which does not seem to have struck the writer as curious, was converted into an archdeacon of Salisbury. Further, the same writer saw no incongruity in identifying this Benedictine monk, some years earlier, with William Alnwick, the Austin canon whom Henry V appointed as confessor of the nunnery of Syon in Middlesex. An antiquary whose name and accurate scholarship we all revere, Mr. Cadwallader Bates, made the suggestion some years ago that William Alnwick, a canon of the Premonstratensian abbey of Alnwick, who got into trouble for treasonable correspondence with the first earl of Northumberland, was the future bishop. And so Dr. Wylie, the historian of the reign of Henry IV, definitely states that Alnwick was not merely a monk of

St. Albans and confessor of Syon, but a canon of Alnwick as well. It would no doubt have been a very useful experience for a prospective archdeacon or bishop to have been a member of three separate religious orders within some ten to fifteen years. Unfortunately, such chopping and changing from order to order, even if it had been permitted, would not have led to advancement in the Church; and it is possible to trace Alnwick's career without confounding him with the canon of Alnwick or the monk of St. Albans, who were totally different persons. It is not unlikely that he received his early education in one of the northern monasteries among one of those bands of boys who, as at Durham, learned their lessons in the almonry of the monastery. We know, however, that he became a clerk in the household of Stephen Scrope, archdeacon of Richmond, and that in 1411, while attached to his service, he received his diploma as notary public from the Pope.¹ Scrope was a prominent member of the university of Cambridge, and Alnwick was enabled to study civil and canon law there, proceeding before 1421 to the degree of LL.D.² He took holy orders, and about 1419 was preferred to the valuable living of Goldsborough in Yorkshire, in his patron's archdeaconry. We do not know when he first obtained notice at court, and I do not think it altogether impossible that, as early as 1414, he may have attracted the attention of Henry V and have been persuaded to take the vows which qualified him for the spiritual charge of the nunnery of Syon. If so, the arrangement was merely temporary, and he must soon have gone back to the legal studies which led to his subsequent preferment. At the end of 1420 he had gained sufficient notice to obtain the archdeaconry of Salisbury,³ an office which, like all archdeaconries, was a natural reward for a capable lawyer in holy orders. He now resigned his church of Goldsborough, but he held with his archdeaconry canonries in St. Paul's and York cathedrals, the mastership of the hospital of St. James at Westminster, on the site of the present St. James' palace, and the valuable deanery of St. Martin's-le-Grand, a post usually reserved for government officials. He was now a man of some importance in the State, and there is some indication that he owed his advancement to the favour of Henry V's half-uncles, the Beauforts. At the accession of Henry VI he was keeper of the privy seal. But, although his legal knowledge and political interest led him thus far, he seems to have abandoned his career as a statesman early in the reign of Henry VI. From the time when in 1426 he became bishop of Norwich, he ceased to take an active part in State affairs. On one occasion in 1431 he went abroad on the king's business, and was present at the trial of Joan of Arc. We know him henceforward as confessor to the young king and as a painstaking diocesan bishop; and, from one little indication of his private reading, a list of books which, some fifteen

¹ *Cal. Pap. Reg.*, vi, p. 333.

² J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, i, p. 23.

cautiously states only 'said to have been LL.D.'

³ *Le Neve Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, ii, p. 624.

years later, he borrowed from a Leicestershire monastery, the interest of his later life was less in law than in theology.

For ten years Alnwick remained bishop of Norwich. His episcopal register¹ is little more than a record of institutions, but from it at any rate it is possible to compile an itinerary. His activity there was marked in three ways. The diocese was full of Lollards, who were quite as obnoxious to orthodox bishops from a political as a theological point of view. Alnwick had no sympathy with the popular and democratic ideas which can be discerned as the motive of the opinions freely and crudely expressed by the Lollards of the 14th and 15th centuries, and he maintained his opposition by the severest measures. A diocesan synod held at Norwich condemned the growing Lollard heresy: a Lollard who had been deprived of a living in Essex and had transferred himself to Norfolk was burned at Norwich, and the others were frightened into a general recantation. Lollards were by no means the only objects of his opposition. The monks of Bury St. Edmunds claimed entire freedom from the jurisdiction of him and his archdeacon. Their claim was backed by long usage and by papal privilege: it rested on similar grounds to those advanced by St. Albans, Westminster, and a few other powerful monasteries. Alnwick, however, attempted to disturb it, and was met by determined resistance on the part of abbot William Curteys. No Lollard could have spoken more bitterly of Alnwick than the monk who celebrated abbot Curteys' triumph on a leaf of the Bury register, now in the British Museum, in which Curteys collected the documentary privileges of his house.²

'And, albeit every evil spreadeth abroad from the north, so, even as when the boat of Peter, in peril from the waves, perished not by grace of the hand of God, shall the monastery of the glorious martyr St. Edmund remain unhurt at his intercession by all the north winds. For one William Alnwick, bishop of Norwich, in the time of the aforesaid abbot, uttered most persistent words against the privilege and exemption of the monastery, and stoutly blew forth the northern wind. But blessed be God, who leaveth not desolate them that trust in Him, and hath fulfilled his mercy in us, restraining the bishop's malice by his grace. One Clement Denston also, the same bishop's archdeacon, and one Nicholas Bakhot, stirred up a strong wind against our exemption and privileges, but the monastery of St. Edmund, founded upon a sure rock, stood unmoved as a mountain, and confusion covered their faces. And even as Berith and Asteroth fled before the face of blessed Bartholomew the apostle, so these wicked folk did flee where no man pursued. And thereafter by God's will were they taken and duly fell into the pit which they had made.'

Equally bitter was the hostility which he excited in the breast of the council of St. Albans when he attempted to visit the dependent cell of Binham. Abbot Wheathampstead, who fancied himself as an elegiac poet, condemned him in strains in which quantity and even syntax struggled uneasily against the northern blast³:

¹ *Norwich Dioc. Registers*, ix.

² B.M. Add. MS. 14848, f. 243 (recto).

³ Johannes Amundesham, *Annales monasterii Sancti Albani* (Rolls series), i, pp. 364-5.

'Magnific pastor, I would magnify thee, didst thou know how to soften thy bowels steeped in Styx. Didst thou know how to be kindly to the prayers of tearfulness, I would give thee a place among the companies of the sainted. If, even as sometime, at the songs of Linus, stones became soft and flints longed to be cloven asunder; or, even as Alecto grew kind in her rage when Orpheus sought the shades and played cunning music, thou wouldst for asking bend thy reckless will, I would magnify thee with the sweet song of the muses and call thee father of fathers, pious and temperate.'

Alnwick's sincere affection for Norwich is clearly shewn in the terms of his will. While he was the 'minister, albeit to no profit', as he said, of its church, he was active in adding to and beautifying the buildings of the cathedral priory. The shallow porch which masks the Norman west doorway of the great church was added in his time: the beautiful cloister was completed by the rebuilding of the alley next the church; and the gatehouse of the bishop's palace was built. In his will he desired his executors to employ part of the residue of his goods in 'causing to be made at his costs a great and becoming window above the western entry into the church of Norwich, to the beautifying and enlightening of the same church, in stone-work, iron-work, glass, hand-work, and in all other necessary material'. The present west window of Norwich cathedral was made shortly after his death, and the magnificent vaulted ceiling which it beautifies and enlightens was added to the nave at the cost of his successor, bishop Walter Lyhart.

In September, 1436, ten years and a month after his promotion to the see of Norwich, Alnwick was translated to the vacant bishopric of Lincoln. His new diocese, though slightly smaller in extent than the vast see of York, involved far more labour and oversight. Much of the diocese of York was moorland: the diocese of Lincoln included the chief river valleys of the Midlands and was thickly studded with towns and villages. For the 680 parishes or so in York, Lincoln contained 1,750. It included eight counties and part of a ninth: Lincolnshire, Rutland, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Oxfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and the northern part of Hertfordshire. The Humber was its northern boundary: the Thames, from the neighbourhood of Windsor to the eastern slopes of the Cotswolds, its southern. Within its limits lay some of the greatest monasteries in England, the Benedictine abbeys of Bardney, Croyland, Peterborough and Ramsey, the abbeys of Austin canons at Leicester and Thornton, and a crowd of smaller houses of which little more than the names are left. The cathedral chapter of Lincoln was one of the largest, and perhaps the wealthiest in England. At Leicester was the college of secular canons which the house of Lancaster had founded and endowed as its memorial and mausoleum¹: at Fotheringhay in the Nene valley was the college maintained by the house of York. The university of Oxford lay within the diocese near its southern border. At the gates of some of the chief

¹ For its history see *The History of the Hospital and the New College of the Annunciation of*

St. Mary in the Newarke, Leicester, by A. Hamilton Thompson 1937.

towns of the see, Oxford, Northampton, Stamford, Bedford and Huntingdon, was a cluster of famous religious houses which afforded constant hospitality to travellers along the main roads from north to south. Among the beneficed clergy of the diocese were a large proportion of the most celebrated clerks in England, men who lived for the most part in the service of the State and of noblemen, and served their churches by curates, after the fashion which prevailed until the first half of the 19th century.

This diocese Alnwick ruled for thirteen years. The record of his episcopate is in no sense startling, but it is one of hard work and devotion to duty. Although the income of the bishop of Lincoln, arising from his lands and rents and the numerous pensions paid into the episcopal treasury, from various sources, was exceedingly large as judged by the standard of our own day, his predecessor, William Gray, had died a relatively poor man. Alnwick could obtain from his executors only 100 m. (£66 13s. 4d.) to meet dilapidations in the first instance. Later, they paid a second instalment of £20 6s. 8d. in money and goods. £87, even when translated into the far larger sum which it represents to-day, was not much for the repair of the many manors and houses which belonged to the see; and Alnwick himself, while inveighing against the extortionate sums which were sometimes exacted for this purpose, and binding his executors to a strict economy, considered that £100 was a proper sum to set apart for his successor's use. Gray had been bishop of Lincoln for only five years. During that time he had shown considerable activity. He had imported several useful clerks into his service from his previous see of London: he had visited the monasteries of his diocese with care and zeal, and had endeavoured, with some labour but with little success, to appease the feud which existed between the dean and chapter of Lincoln. In both these tasks Alnwick followed him with equal energy and with more result.

The records of Alnwick's episcopate are contained in four MSS. in the diocesan records at Lincoln. His official register, a collection of mandates and letters preserved partly as common forms to serve as models for future correspondence on similar topics, partly for their intrinsic importance, and of records of institutions, is a somewhat disappointing volume. It was posted up at irregular intervals from the rough memoranda written on paper by his clerks, and much of it does not seem to have been copied in until after his death.¹ Much more interesting is his visitation book of the dean and chapter of Lincoln,² which, with its associated documents, has been printed in Bradshaw and Wordsworth's *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*.³ Even more valuable are the almost unique minutes of some seventy visitations of monasteries in all parts of the diocese.⁴ This MS., which is incomparably the fullest

¹ *Lincoln Episcopal Records, Reg. xviii.*

² *Lincoln Ep. Records, VI/2.*

³ Vol. ii, pt. ii, pp. 364-465.

⁴ *Lincoln Ep. Records, VI/1, Lincoln Record Society vols. 14, 21.*

source of evidence for the condition of the monasteries during the century preceding the suppression, I have had the privilege of transcribing, translating and editing. The fourth MS. is a much damaged fragment of a consistory court-book, which was discovered some years ago by the late Canon C. W. Foster. Such books are extremely rare at this date, and the substantial fragment which has escaped decay and damp throws much light upon the moral and social condition of the diocese.¹

I do not propose to analyse the contents of these books, but merely to give a picture of the activities of the bishop which they reveal. The oversight which the diocese required was considerable. Nowadays, when a bishop's attendance is constantly needed at meetings of diocesan boards and countless societies, the work of a diocese is habitually centralized in two or three places, and a diocese, to be effectively worked, can embrace only a limited area. But the complicated organization of our own day was unknown in the Middle Ages. Diocesan synods were held at stated intervals: each rural deanery had its chapter, which met on occasion to discuss and decide questions of local discipline and order. The bishop held visitations in each archdeaconry, either in person or by commission, once in every three years. But the system of financial contributions to religious objects, which plays so large a part to-day, was then extremely simple, when a man's religious duties were still as natural a part of his daily life as his meals or his sleep. The maintenance of his cathedral church, of his parish priest, of diocesan officials generally, were taxes which he had to meet, not without grumbling, but with the general acknowledgement that the Church did something for him and that he owed it something in return. There was no question of Church extension or providing funds for new parishes. Church building was a matter for local fabric funds, occasionally aided by an indulgence from headquarters. In outlying parts of large parishes there were chapels of ease served at the expense of the incumbent of the mother church. In Leicestershire alone there were 109 such chapels. To convert these into separate parish churches would have been to deprive the parish priest of his dues. Private benefactors increased the staff of clergy by founding chantries in churches, whose chaplains said mass daily for their souls and frequently kept the parish school as part of their duties. Such activities as foreign missions were unknown: occasionally in the 15th century an energetic Pope roused the Church to contributions for a crusade against the Turk or heretics nearer home. It may be said that, in the main, the work of such a bishop as Alnwick was, not to lend his blessing to a multitude of various objects maintained by individual contributions, but to exercise his vigilance over a compact body of professing Christians who owed him allegiance as their spiritual superior, to guard their faith and morals as far as was possible, and to correct and punish such lapses in either case as came under his notice.

¹ *Lincoln Ep. Records*, C/o Much of this has been printed in *The English Clergy and*

their Organisation in the later Middle Ages (Oxford, 1947), pp. 206-46.

Many of Alnwick's contemporaries were content to do this by deputy and neglected their dioceses for the great and arduous positions which they held in the State. Their ordinations and confirmations were left to suffragan bishops with small stipends, bishops who had retired or were unable to gain their revenues from sees in Ireland or were dignified with titles taken from cities in Mohammedan or heathen countries. The general business of the diocese—York is a case in point—was left to vicars-general and commissaries. It is much to Alnwick's credit that for thirteen years he managed his huge diocese without the help of a suffragan. Much formal business was transacted by his clerks at Lincoln, in the various manor-houses of the see, and at his town house in the Old Temple. But, although he was often in London, attending on his royal friend and pupil, there is every sign that his diocese was a subject of constant attention and supervision with him. From the dates of his documents, we can tell his whereabouts on most days of those thirteen years with tolerable accuracy; and they reveal the fact that by far the larger part of each year was spent in his own diocese. There are few if any signs of holiday, unless his summer visits to his manor of Wooburn in Buckinghamshire can be taken as such. His visits to London, which lay within easy reach of the southern part of his diocese, were frequently interrupted by a return of a few days to the nearer districts under his care. He never was far away: the furthest places to which he can be traced are Winchester and Wingfield in Derbyshire. Now and then he spent a day or two in Cambridge on business connected with Henry VI's foundation of King's college; but at Cambridge he was only some thirteen miles from his own borders. At Windsor and Reading, which exhaust the list of his extra-diocesan visits, he had only to cross the river to find himself in his archdeaconries of Buckingham and Oxford.

Moreover, his sojourn in the diocese of Lincoln was not confined to one place. His manor-houses lay scattered about the wide area of the see. He enlarged and beautified his palace at Lincoln, but palaces in cathedral cities were not places of repose for a bishop, in the immediate neighbourhood of a chapter jealous of its liberties, and he preferred the country house at Nettleham, two miles outside the city. He was often at Sleaford castle, some eighteen miles south of Lincoln and a favourite residence of its 15th-century bishops. Bishop's Wooburn formed, as we have seen, a convenient summer residence, and lay between London and Oxford. Buckden in Huntingdonshire, about midway between Lincoln and London, was the most convenient house of all, and remained the chief house of the bishops of Lincoln until the boundaries of the diocese were revised in 1837. It lay close to the North Road, it was not far from Cambridge, and access from it to the whole south-eastern and central part of the diocese was easy. But his favourite residence, and certainly the most central of all, was Liddington¹ in Rutland, on the north bank of the

¹ Liddington Beke house, now the property of the Marquess of Exeter.

Welland. Of some of the houses in which he thus spent a portion of every year but little remains. The gate-house of the old palace of Lincoln, in which the diocesan muniments were preserved until 1936, is still known as the Alnwick Tower. Of Sleaford castle only a few mounds remain. Of Nettleham and Wooburn little but the sites are left. At Buckden the oldest portion, the brick gate-house, was not built till some thirty years after his death. But the old manor-house at Liddington, although much altered by his successors forty to fifty years later, may still belong largely to his time. To the church hard by, the nave of which was rebuilt not long before or not long after his death, he bequeathed ten marks, the largest sum which he left to any church on his estates; and much of the glass in the windows of the hall and great chamber of the manor-house was evidently put in by him. In the patterned border of two of the windows his armorial bearings recur in alternate panes: their quarry-glass is stained with a three-headed lily in full flower, round the stalk of which is wound a scroll with his motto 'Delectare in Domino'; and, in the window of the great chamber his arms, the quarries and the motto are found again, with a figure of a kneeling archbishop, probably that of his patron, St. William of York, and the crosier and some fragments of a similar figure of a bishop, which must have been his own.

As he journeyed about from manor to manor a number of clerks and notaries travelled with him, acting as his secretaries and registrars. There is some indication that at each of the principal manor-houses there was a permanent office, presided over by one or other of the clerks, who attended to such business as could be dispatched there. It is hardly any wonder that, with all the business done in these various places, with the bishop instituting clergy and issuing documents in remote villages in Oxfordshire or Buckinghamshire, the chief register at Lincoln was so irregularly kept. If it were not that the custom of two centuries of such work had inured registrars to their task, it would have been a wonder that it was kept at all. The bishop's right-hand men, who usually accompanied him on his business journeys, were his chancellor, John Depyng, and his registrar, Thomas Colstone. Depyng was a priest and a learned lawyer, holding a canonry of Lincoln with the prebend, the fruits of which were derived from the church of Buckden. He had served previous bishops, and, outside the diocese, his name must have been well known, as he was one of the commissaries appointed by the Pope to arbitrate between the town and university of Cambridge. The decision in this famous law-suit, known as the Barnwell process, settled the controversies between town and gown, and defined the limits of their respective jurisdictions. Colstone was a notary public by papal appointment, but does not appear to have taken Holy Orders. His actual home was at Corby, about eight miles south of Grantham, but he spent most of his life at Lincoln or travelling about with one bishop after another. His hand can be traced in the Lincoln registers before

1400, and he was in the service of the see for more than fifty years. It was his duty and that of the three or four other notaries who were habitually with him—Thorpe, Bug, and another Colstone are often named—to take down notes of all official proceedings and to draw up the bishop's mandates and letters. The evidence of corrections and marginal notes in rough copies of certain documents shews that these, when composed, were submitted to Depying or another of the bishop's clerks and revised by him before the fair copy was made out and sealed. It is obvious that such documents, in which common forms were adroitly handled to suit special occasions, contain little of the personal element, and are of no more guide to the bishop's personal character than is a marriage licence in our own day. On the other hand, their formal wording was expanded freely so as to include definite details of the reasons for which they were issued, and, if they are of little value for the student of personality, they are of the greatest use to the student of manners and morals in general.

Other clerks, canons of Lincoln and beneficed clergy, accompanied the bishop's wanderings. Robert Thornton, archdeacon of Bedford, John Beverley, Thomas Duffield, Thomas Twyer, who held the living of Brighthurst near Liddington, and was one of Alnwick's executors, and John Derby, were among his most constant companions. When he visited a monastery, one of these men was usually selected to deliver the visitation sermon in the chapter-house. The texts of these sermons are usually recorded, and occasionally the registrar takes occasion to praise the preacher's elegance and polish and to remark upon the very pretty fashion in which he acquitted himself. If anyone imagines that the clergy of the Middle Ages knew nothing of Scripture, the texts of these sermons should undeceive him. They were chosen with the greatest ingenuity from all parts of the Bible, and it is generally easy to catch their general drift and application. The bishop's visitation was likened to the visit of Joseph to his brethren in the field, or to that of David to the army of Israel, to the triumphal entry of our Lord into Jerusalem. Analogies to it were drawn from the prophecies, often in a somewhat threatening text. At nunneries texts were frequently taken from the Song of Songs: the nuns were reminded that the voice of the bishop was the voice of the Bridegroom to the Church, His bride: they were invited to receive the visitation as the daughters of Syon came forth to see king Solomon, *Surge, prospera, amica mea, veni*. At visitations also, where the convents were large in number, the clerks took part in the examination of individual members. In the chapter-house at Peterborough, after Alnwick had privately examined the abbot and chief officers, one by one, he committed the rest of the inquiry to Depying and Thornton. Each, accompanied by a notary, took up his station in different parts of the building, and heard the remaining depositions in answer to their questions. Or sometimes, when there were many monasteries to be visited and the bishop could not get to all, Depying,

Thornton or Derby was commissioned to hold a visitation on his behalf.

It is from the depositions recorded in these visitation documents that we come face to face with the life of the diocese. The difficulties with which Alnwick had to contend were great. It was his duty as bishop, so ran the time-honoured phrase, to root out the weeds in the Lord's field with the hoe of his jurisdiction, and to encourage the plants of righteousness. We naturally hear more of the weeds than of the plants: the object of a visitation was primarily to correct error, not to advertise virtue. But it must be owned that the tares were plentiful. At Lincoln a headstrong and passionate dean, John Macworth, was at strife with his chapter and claimed precedence in his church even over the bishop. The chancellor, Peter Partrich, had offended him: their quarrels went on even in church, and one evening in the middle of vespers, some of the dean's men dragged Partrich out of his stall by the hair of his head and flogged him in quire. It is hardly any wonder that, with these variations upon the peaceful ritual of the cathedral, Partrich, who was bound by his office to continual residence, was glad occasionally to escape to his country living of Biddenden in Kent, on the plea that he wished to recreate his parishioners by preaching. In other secular colleges there was strife among the fellows. At Irthlingborough in Northamptonshire one man assaulted another on the steps of the college hall: at Fotheringhay a pilfering lay steward had divided the college into two parties, whose mutual bickering was a local scandal. If a general verdict can fairly be passed upon the state of the monasteries, it comes to this, that bad financial management had produced much quarrelling and carelessness. The hospitality which they were bound to exercise ran away with money: their affairs, as at Bardney, got into the hands of an unscrupulous and worldly monk, or, as at Peterborough, were managed by the lay friends and relatives of an old and feeble abbot. Disastrous expedients were employed to raise ready money: pensions from the common funds were sold at a nominal sum and remained as heavy yearly charges on the house; leases were granted for lump sums at a dead loss to the monastery. Offences against morals were common. Houses, however, where they were general were rare. The visitations of Ramsey, the largest abbey in the diocese, and Dorchester abbey in Oxfordshire revealed a surprising state of corruption. On the other hand, Croyland and Bourne abbeys were well governed; and at Peterborough, in spite of much laxness and financial difficulty, the standard of morals was fairly high, and in 1438 the only specific complaint was that the monks occasionally went to dances in the town. In 1446, under a new abbot, things were much worse. The abbot himself got into serious trouble, and was actually suspended for two years and ordered to go into retirement at the cell of Oxney, three miles off. It is satisfactory to notice that he recovered his character and ruled the abbey not without distinction for many years.

I need not multiply examples. It is well to remember, in a day when religion is an individual matter and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in other than purely spiritual affairs is a thing of the past, that the existence of church courts to which everyone was amenable gave special prominence to such offences as I have mentioned. The person who walked soberly, righteously and godly passed unnoticed and unreported. It is only the delinquents of whom we hear, and the delinquents, clerical and lay, when all is said and done, formed a very small proportion of the population of the diocese.

There is no indication that Alnwick's personal supervision of his diocese was ever relaxed or intermitted. Much of his work was necessarily delegated to the clerks of whom I have spoken, but, so far as his purely episcopal duties were concerned, he had no helper. There is at any rate no record of a suffragan bishop in the diocese during his time; and, if Alnwick's ordination lists remained, I think we should find that by far the larger number of his ordinations, if not all, were celebrated by himself. Moreover, although work might be delegated to commissaries or to archdeacons and their officials, yet where the bishop was there was the centre of the diocese. The consistory court moved with him or followed not far behind him. If you were a fraudulent executor, if you had married a woman while you or she were under contract to another, if you spoke incautiously of sacred things in Boston market, and, were 'Lincolned', as the phrase ran, for these offences, it was not to Lincoln that you would necessarily be summoned, but quite as likely to Sleaford or Buckden. And, when you appeared or failed to appear, and the case was adjourned, you might be summoned to reappear at Liddington or Nettleham, or at some place on the bishop's route between manor and manor.

The perpetual moving of the centre of business meant the moving of the whole household; and this was no small matter. We have a very precise estimate of the size of Alnwick's household in an account of the expenses incurred by abbot Assheton of Peterborough when he went to obtain confirmation of his election at Buckden.¹ Clerks, notaries and servants, one and all, naturally expected their tips. Five marks were paid by the abbot as his fee for the sealing of the confirmation charter. The clerks of the bishop's chapel sang mass on the day of the confirmation and received two marks. Two and a half marks went to master Thomas Colstone the registrar and his clerks. The bishop's domestic chaplain, his marshal, chamberlain and the serjeant of his cellar had half a mark each. One quarter of a mark was given to each of his six esquires, the gentlemen-in-waiting, sons, as a rule, of county families, often dignified by the title of *domicelli* or donzels. Each of the twelve yeomen of the household had one eighth of a mark, each of the nine grooms a shilling. Fifteenpence was divided among the horse-

¹ Associated Architectural Societies' reports and papers, xxxiv, pp. 277-9.

grooms, a shilling among the scullions. Two clerks of the bishop's chancery received each sixteenpence. If these fees, some ten pounds in all, seem exorbitant, they were nothing to the fees and gratuities which the king's clerks demanded at Woodstock, when the abbot appeared there to recover his temporalities. These amounted to some sixty pounds, which included a fee of five pounds to the duke of Gloucester as chamberlain of England, five pounds to the master of the rolls, and two pounds, ten shillings to the keeper of the petty bag, and no less than forty pounds to the clerk of the privy seal. And again, if this money-making aspect of the bishop's household strikes us as inconsistent with apostolic ideals, we must remember that the fees charged to the abbot were small compared with those which Alnwick himself must have paid out of his privy purse for his translation from Norwich to Lincoln—the heavy price of a bull from Rome, *douceurs* to officials at the papal court, costly payments for the recovery of temporalities from the king, and the charges of the enthronement at Lincoln. We are apt to regard the Middle Ages through the romantic medium of those splendid works of art which appeal so strongly to our modern imagination, and to regard our own age as the embodiment of unromantic common-sense. The medieval attitude to money, however, was severely practical and unimaginative; and those who read their Chaucer well will see how the love of beautiful form and colour, inherited by the medieval Englishman, like his religion, as a matter of course, and founded, like everything else, upon traditional common forms which had sunk deep into the English mind, coexisted with a hard and even cynical common-sense. We must not judge those days, I repeat, by the standard of an age in which religion and art are regarded as separate departments of life, divorced from the prosaic concerns of daily business. The wool-merchants, on their way from north and south to drive hard bargains at the staple at Boston, heard mass every morning when the day-bell rang at their stopping-places: none appreciated more keenly the beauty of the magnificent churches which they passed on their road, and, throughout the eastern counties building after building bears witness to a munificence which saw no incompatibility between a matter-of-fact business life and the claims of religion and beauty. To make money and to save their souls were affairs of equal importance, and they paid little attention to the inconsistencies of conduct upon which the modern world lays so much stress.

And if, at first sight, this travelling bishop, proceeding from manor to manor with his expensive following, which could hardly be altogether proof against the temptations of avarice, seems to us more ornamental than useful; if the diocese felt the burden and expense of his periodical visitations, there is on the other hand no doubt that he took the higher responsibilities of his office seriously. His only detractors were the monks of Bury and St. Albans, whose liberties he endeavoured to curtail, and the worst they could say of him was to hint a general comparison

between his actions and the devices of Satan. Gascoigne, the Oxford scholar who belaboured the bishops of his age with outspoken accusations of absenteeism, venality and ignorance, refers to him twice without a hint of blame. Brought up in strict orthodoxy and conservatism, Alnwick had no sympathy with radical views in religion and politics. On the other hand, he was himself a learned man, and it is clear that one of the ruling passions of his life was to encourage learning among the clergy and religious orders. While bishop of Norwich, he took part in the founding of the hostel for Benedictine monks at Cambridge which afterwards became Magdalene college. As bishop of Lincoln and spiritual adviser of the king, he aided Henry VI in the foundation of the sister colleges of Blessed Mary of Eton and the King's college of St. Mary and St. Nicholas at Cambridge. In Eton college chapel, while its walls were rising, under a temporary awning spread for the purpose, he consecrated the learned Thomas Bekynton to be bishop of Bath and Wells. In the old chapel of King's college at Cambridge, soon after the foundation of the present magnificent chapel had been laid, he consecrated the master of Pembroke, John Langton, to be bishop of St. David's. In 1440 he joined Ralph, Lord Cromwell, cardinal Beaufort and other Lancastrian nobles in founding the college of Tattershall in his own diocese, which, like Eton, was at once a college of chantry-priests and a place for the education of poor scholars. With the second earl of Northumberland and his son and heir, Lord Poynings, he founded the chantry of St. Mary in Alnwick church, the priests of which were bound to instruct the children who resorted to them in the rudiments of grammar. Further, he fulfilled to the uttermost the duty incumbent on the higher clergy of his time, of keeping a number of lads at school and the university at his own cost. In his will, made four years before his death, he directed his executors to lay out part of the residue of his goods in the education of poor scholars from the dioceses of Norwich and Lincoln at Oxford and Cambridge, 'and in this number I will that the lads whom I shall have dwelling with me at the time of my death, or proceeding to the universities at my cost be included and given the preference'. In his attitude to learning and education, he takes a high place, if not the highest, among those prelates who were the harbingers of the English Renaissance.

Long though he had been separated from his birthplace, he remembered it in his will.¹ He left bequests towards the walling of the town, injured by the incursions of the Scots, to the abbey of Alnwick and the Carmelite friars of Hulne—the only religious houses mentioned in the document. Its Latin is involved and rather inelegant, but it contains passages which, with some eloquence, display his feeling towards contemporary abuses. I am bound to say that such passages have a suspicious likeness to others in episcopal wills; but the use of common

¹ Reg. Stafford f. 178b-179b.

forms implies some sympathy with their contents. Most significant is his condemnation of the greed of the higher clergy. His legacy of £100 to his successor for dilapidations is hedged about with stringent precautions. He recalls the extravagant claims made upon the fortunes of deceased bishops and other clergy by their successors. Such men, he says, 'exact money in so immoderate and excessive a quantity against all justice, and exort it from executors, who of their faint-heartedness prefer to favour the living rather than the dead, that the last wills of the dead cannot be fulfilled even as regards such bequests as are left from the residue for the use of the poor and other pious reasons. To neglect to interfere with the perverse ways of such folk is naught else than to give them encouragement'. He therefore strictly limited the sum, 'lest to the peril of my soul I may appear to lend consent to any successor of mine who shall be willing to err, which God forbid, on this wise, but rather that I may seem to hinder so great a misdeed, nor become a partaker in such guilt'.

His provisions for his household included money bequests to his esquires, yeomen and grooms. He desired his executors to keep such of his household as were willing in one lodging together for six months after his death, providing them with victuals, pay and clothing at the accustomed rates until they were able to find other service. The bulk of his goods were to be sold to meet the expenses of the will. The only goods which he mentions apart from the money to be obtained from the sale were left to the priests of Alnwick church and the canons of Alnwick abbey. To the church he left his third best missal and an anthem-book, together with a complete suit of vestments of cloth of gold interwoven with golden lions. His legacy to the abbey was two small silver basins for use at mass at the high altar, with flowers enamelled on their bases and a pipe in the side of one of them. But we know also of the splendid processional cross which he gave in his lifetime to Lincoln cathedral, with figures of St. Mary and St. John on each side of the crucifix, and his motto 'Delectare in Domino' engraved on the knop with other ornaments¹; and of vestments which he also presented to the church.²

He desired to be buried in the nave of Lincoln cathedral, in the place which he occupied in the Sunday procession, when it made its last station before entering the quire. No monument was erected over him: he lies beneath the floor of the nave, close to the west doorway, and everyone who enters the church in summer, when the western doors stand open all day, passes over Alnwick's remains as he treads out of the bright sunlight into the dim cavern of the nave. The stone slab which marks the place is modern, distinguished by that Gothic lettering which only the 19th century could execute.

¹ 'Inventories of Plate, Vestments, etc., belonging to the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Mary of Lincoln,' ed. Christopher

Wordsworth, *Archaeologia*, liii (1893), 19.

² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

He left no directions as to how his place of burial should be marked ; but he bequeathed money for a chantry at an altar hard by, at which he and his early benefactor, Stephen Scrope, should be remembered daily before God. I think that, in all these dispositions, we can trace the character of a man, rigid in opinions which may now seem to us obsolete, but were regarded by him as essential to the salvation of himself and others, true and just in all his dealings, ever mindful of his home and his benefactors, unspoiled by power, considerate of those who shared his daily labours and anxieties, upright and honest in an age when falseness and baseness were all too common. And such men, faithful to their traditions and their creed, whatever they may be, or into whatever mistakes they may lead them, spread their beams abroad and are the lights of a naughty world.

THE SOURCES OF THE DESIGN OF THE WEST FRONT OF PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL

By GEOFFREY F. WEBB

Of all the great church façades of the 13th century that of Peterborough is at once the most original and the most puzzling (Fig. 1 and Plates XXIII and XXVB). There is an almost complete lack of documentary evidence as to the building of the main parts of it,¹ and though there are indications in the masonry of various stages in the development of the scheme they leave us with many problems unsolved. Sir Charles Peers, to whom is due the only authoritative account of the building,² suggests three stages in the development of the existing front. In the first stage the nave was prolonged for two bays beyond the earliest scheme, new Western towers (the existing ones) were begun and the Western transept was carried up to the floor of the clearstory passage on the East side (rather lower to the North and South), the North and South walls of the transept being left unfinished on a line sloping from East to West roughly from the springing of the North and South windows to the level of the sills. Westwards of this nothing more than foundations seems to have been done. This stage is attributed to Abbot Benedict 1173-94. The second stage was completed about 1200, and included the finishing of the North and South walls of the Western transept to the base of the gables and the West wall to the height of the story above the doorways. The masonry of this stage can be traced returning round the inner ends of the portico and sloping downwards to the West so that it is only some two courses above the bases at its lowest. At the same time the existing triangular piers were begun. The third stage, which was presumably complete in the main before the dedication of 1238, includes the towers which flank the portico to the North and South, the vaulting of the portico and the gables and turrets of the front itself and of the Western transept ends. The main North-West tower over the transept if not finished by 1238 was most likely nearly so.

Sir Charles Peers suggests that a drastic change was made in the whole character of the design when in the third stage it was decided to increase the width of the side arches and to provide abutment to them by the addition of the flanking towers. He suggests that this alteration was probably made to gain more light in the Western parts of the interior by opening up the Western wall. It seems a rather extravagant way out of a difficulty which cannot have been very pressing in view of the tall windows in the North, South and East walls of the transept itself.

¹ Abbot Benedict is recorded to have 'built' the nave from the central tower usque ad Rountem (1173-94), and Abbot Robert of Lindsey to have glazed 30 windows which have been

assumed to be at the West end (1214-22). The former statement is only partially true, the latter very vague.

² *V.C.H. Northamptonshire*, ii, 931 pl. (?).

The most striking evidence recorded by Sir Charles Peers in distinguishing these three stages is the introduction of vertical instead of diagonal tooling at the second stage. Sir Charles dates this work to the period 1193-1200 which seems early as compared with Bilson's dating of the change from diagonal to vertical at Wells to 1210 to 1215.² The change from stage two to stage three does not seem to be so strongly marked, and it is possible that the longest break in the building operations came before the West wall of the church was undertaken.

This may have a bearing on the question whether the width of the side arches which are very large in comparison with the central arch of the portico is the result of a makeshift alteration or part of a highly intellectualized and ambitious design.

One thing seems certain about the Peterborough portico and transept, that the scheme as a whole derives ultimately from the treatment of the West end of Lincoln Cathedral. This parentage was recognized by 19th-century scholars, and Sir Charles Peers bases on it his belief that the portico as envisaged at the second stage of its evolution was to have had one wide central arch with two narrower arches on either side corresponding to the ends of the aisles. However that may have been, the analogy with Lincoln is certainly true and extends further than the presence of three tall arches as the main features of the West Front. The Lincoln West Front is one of the most remarkable schemes of its kind (Fig. 2). It is certain that it passed through an




FIG. 2. WEST FRONT OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL


intermediate stage between the original 11th-century conception and the enlarged front that now exists. The 11th-century design has been discussed at length by the late Professor Saxl in this journal. The final stage which was conditioned by the completion of the Gothic nave and the addition of buildings at the West outside the North and South aisles was completed in the second quarter of the 13th century, but almost certainly later than the completion of Peterborough. It is the intermediate stage (Plate XXIV) dating from the mid 12th century, and probably due to the magnificent Bishop Alexander (*ob.* 1148), that is

² *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxv (1928).

relevant to the Peterborough design. Except for one important point, the height of the central arch and the treatment of the gable above it, we can be fairly certain of the appearance of the Lincoln front at this stage. The essentials of the design were fixed by the 11th-century builders, and consist of a solid Western block returned to the North and South outside the aisles and surmounted by two towers which rise up from well inside the planes of the North, South and West walls; at Lincoln the towers are set back some 11 feet from the outer plane of the front. This type of West end treatment has continental parallels notably in the Meuse valley at Liege (2 examples) and Maastricht.⁴ The special distinction of the Lincoln design is the use of the three great arched recesses in the West side and their companion in the Southern return. We do not know how the West block at Lincoln was finished or intended to be finished in the 11th century, whether with straight eaves as at Liege or with gables or a combination of both. When with the building of the towers the whole scheme was completed other important changes were introduced into the design. These consist, on the front itself, of enrichments to the three doors within the recesses, the band of sculpture above the outer niches and rows of intersecting blind arcading above the two great side recesses; the towers themselves were carried up to a very considerable height in a very splendid enriched Romanesque, and equally enriched gables adorned with arcading and diaper were built, three to the West and one each to the North and South. Those at the sides are still visible. The reconstruction published in *Vetusta Monumenta*, 1792, sufficiently indicates the effect. The essential characteristics of the design in its completed form are the expression given to the self-sufficient character of the Western block, independent of the towers and the nave itself by the gables standing bold from the towers, and the contrast between the monumental and austere qualities of the lower part, even with its added sculptures, and the intricacy of the upper parts, including the gables and the towers. These characteristics are found again at Peterborough, though the contrast between the upper and lower parts of the design is less one of plain and enriched surfaces. The differences between Lincoln and Peterborough are, however, profound. The Peterborough scheme consists of two parallel vaulted spaces, the Western transept and the portico divided by the Western wall of the transept. This means that the towers above the transepts have much less substantial supports than at Lincoln and indeed are much smaller, and they play a much less important part in the total effect. It also means that as the portico backs against a transept which is the full height of the central vessel of the nave of the church, there is no reason why the arches of the portico should be of different heights, and indeed they all three rise to the full height of the West transept vaults. Thirdly, the greater depth


⁴ These Western blocks are described by Fels & Reinhardt Bull. *Mon.* (1933), as 'massif

de façade surmonté de deux clochers en retraite'.



SECTION OF WEST TRANSEPT AND PORTICO, PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL

(From John Hallon, *Cathedral Architecture*, 1823)



WEST FRONT OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL IN THE 12TH CENTURY

(From *Veneranda Monimenta*, 1792)

of the portico as compared with the recesses at Lincoln means that the fronts of the gables stand about twice³ as far forward of the towers at Peterborough as they do at Lincoln. The greater dimensions of the Peterborough front, 152 feet wide as compared with 110 and 108 (about), as compared with 70 feet in height, also helps to reduce the relative importance of the Peterborough towers until they become hardly more than important incidents in the general composition of the top of the façade. This effect seems to be recognized and stressed by the similarity in treatment of the angle turrets of the towers to the tall octagonal pinnacles which flank the three Western gables and those to the North and South.

Sir Charles Peers has pointed out that when the Western wall of the church came to be built, i.e., at the time when vertical tooling appears at Peterborough, an interesting and unusual course was adopted. The treatment of the East side of the wall was broadly determined by the responds of the opposite side of the transept, but on the West or outer side these vertical divisions have been ignored altogether, and instead of dividing the wall and the vault above it into five bays corresponding to the nave, the aisles and the two transeptal extensions, it is divided into seven in such a way that the bays fall into three groups, of which the middle one is equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ of the side groups, or as Sir Charles puts it : ' the width of the middle bay, plus that of the narrow bays on each side of it, is three times that of each of the other four bays '. In order to achieve this spacing the two side doorways have had to be displaced inwards so that they are noticeably off centre in the bay divisions of the interior of the Western wall, and do not correspond in any obvious way with the three great arches of the portico (Fig. 1).

These observations of Sir Charles Peers may lead to some curious speculations. Not only is the relationship of the side bays to the middle bays as two to three, but if we assume a unit of $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet subdivided into three, i.e., $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet, the subdivisions of the middle group of bays become as three to four. Now it is accepted that the medieval builders generally made use of a ' yardstick ' for the setting out of their designs which varied from building to building. The use of such special units has been demonstrated for certain types of building, notably Cistercian churches, and is also known for certain medieval buildings such as Milan cathedral, a very well documented enterprise. It is reasonable to suppose that a similar method may have been used at Peterborough. If a yardstick of $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet divided into 3, or of 9 feet divided into 2 and again into 3 (perhaps a more likely suggestion) be assumed, the setting out of the Peterborough portico resolves itself into a system of arithmetical ratios of a simple but significant kind. The ratios 1 : 2, 2 : 3, and 3 : 4 are those which were handed down from antiquity in the *Timaeus* of Plato and Boethius de *Musica* as of special significance being the

³ 11 ft. at Lincoln and about 22 ft. at Peterborough.

equivalent ratios to the musical intervals diapason (octave) diapente (fifth) and diatessaron (fourth). Both in antiquity and again in 15th- and early 16th-century Italy a curious significance was given to these ratios which does not concern us here except as evidence of the importance attached to them and the prestige they enjoyed. The sources from which the men of the Renaissance derived their knowledge of the antique theory of numbers, and on which their own speculations and practise were based were unquestionably familiar to the educated men of the 12th and 13th centuries who were much concerned with this type of speculation.⁶ The crucial problem is how far the knowledge of the learned and their interest in such matters could appeal to the men responsible for setting out the design of the Peterborough portico. There is plenty of evidence from Villard d'Honnecourt who as regards part of the MSS. may be considered an almost contemporary witness that much of antique geometrical theory was known and used if in no very systematic way by medieval master builders. According to M. de Bruyne⁷ these simple arithmetical ratios formed part of the stock in trade of such men as Villard d'Honnecourt, and are certainly ultimately based on Antique Musical theory. He raises the question in this relation and in relation to the reminiscences of Vitruvius to be found in the MS. whether these are not part of a tradition rather than implying a first-hand knowledge of Antique sources. But a tradition can be refreshed, and it seems easier to suppose that the 'geometry' of the great masons, though in part no doubt traditional, was in part a reflection of the learning of their contemporaries. Vitruvius, for example, may have come to some of them at no more than second-hand.⁸

The design of the top of the Peterborough front (Plate XXV), with its memorable assemblage of spires, towers, turrets and enriched gables, is almost as unusual and puzzling a problem as that of the portico and its three great arches. Mr. J. T. Irvine⁹ in the 19th century assumed a pause in the building and a change of design after the work had reached the great string course beneath the gables, and pointed to the displacement outwards of the two turrets which flank the central gable and the awkward management of the gargoyles for draining the valleys between the three roofs of the portico in relation to the clustered shafts between the arches. He also considered that the stopping off with half arches of the arcades in which figures and windows alternate across the base of the gables themselves, and the way in which the wheel windows are brought down so that they engage with the tops of these arcades, indicates that a design originally conceived for taller and wider gables

⁶ For the Renaissance exploitation of this musical ratios in architecture see Wittkower, *Principles of Humanist Architecture* (1949).

⁷ de Bruyne, *Études d'Athétique Médiévale*, vol. iii, pp. 251 ff.

⁸ It has not been possible to make a really thorough survey of the Peterborough front, but it seems likely that if this were done the

use of the simple arithmetical ratios based on Boethius de Musica would be found to have gone much farther than is indicated here. For example, the inner measurements of the centre arch of the portico to those of the two wide side arches appears also to be two to three, i.e., approximately 18 ft. and 27 ft.

⁹ *J.B.A.A.*, xlix (1893), 138-150.



A. FAKED PHOTOGRAPH OF WEST FRONT OF PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL



B. WEST FRONT OF PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL AS AT PRESENT

had been modified to suit their present size. Sir Charles Peers does not suggest any such change in design, and considers that the clustered shafts on the outer faces of the triangular piers which stop off at the great string, and are interrupted so strangely by the gargoyles, belong to the last phase of the building together with the flanking towers and the widening of the side arches. These clustered shafts match those at the angles of the flanking towers where they are carried up above the great string till they are modified at their tops as part of the alterations of the 14th and 15th century. It is possible to reconcile both Mr. Irvine's and Sir Charles' views to some extent by supposing that changes were made in the design of the gables in the course of the work, perhaps when it was decided to carry up the transeptal towers. It can also be said that the essential character of the upper works at Peterborough, especially the wheel windows in the Western gables, resembles most nearly the Eastern parts of Beverley, a work dated *c.* 1225-45, and that the wheel windows certainly seem more developed than the Dean's Eye at Lincoln of about 1205, or not long after, and this agrees well with the general time-table of the work as outlined above.

One of the points made by Mr. Irvine is the position of the substantial turrets which are placed, not above the clustered shafts but well outside their outer lines, and both he and Sir Charles Peers assume that these were so placed to give breadth and importance to the centre gable. There is, however, another possible reading of the composition. These turrets are very close, both in bulk and character, to the angle turrets of the transeptal tower, and may be taken to relate to them rather than to each other and the central gable. If this is so they are intended to form the innermost features of two great complexes consisting of the side gables, the turrets of the transept ends, and the transeptal towers themselves. This leaves a narrow vertical progression of the central arch, its gable and the space between the towers as the central feature of the whole design. The fake¹⁰ photograph (Plate XXVA), showing the effect of the presence of both transeptal towers, makes this reading seem much more plausible than words, and it is reinforced by the interesting variation in the treatment of the wheel windows. That in the centre gable has eight lights so disposed that the acute points of two of them come on the vertical line, while those in the side gables have six lights trefoiled and not acutely pointed, so arranged as to make a spreading effect. The late 14th-century porch and chapel built between the piers of the central arch of the front by its emphasis on breadth and the way in which it obscures the vertical lines of the archway, does much to vitiate the whole of this aspect of the design. An early engraving of the church shows a wooden spire on the North-West transeptal tower, and if we imagine two of these added to the photograph the suggested reading becomes even more convincing. Moreover, the whole com-

¹⁰ I have to thank Mr. F. T. A. Power, of the R.C.H.M. staff for this most ingenious photograph.

position begins to recall the general lines of its 12th-century forerunner at Lincoln in its contrast of monumental lower part with varied and enriched superstructure.

To sum up : the Peterborough West Front is derived from 12th-century Lincoln, but conditioned by the presence behind it of a high Western transept. It seems to have been set out on a system of simple arithmetical ratios which imply the existing positions of the side doors, and therefore make it likely that the side arches were intended from that time to have their existing relation to the central arch. The intention of the 13th-century design of the front is made difficult to appreciate by the absence of the Southern transeptal tower and of the wooden spires, one of which seems to have been built on the completed Northern transeptal tower. It has been further obscured by the insertion of the 14th-century porch and chapel.

If, as seems likely, the design of this front is a most highly intellectualized and ambitious experiment based on a system of proportion deriving from the study of the Antique theory of numbers, it is perhaps worthy of remark that this experiment was largely vitiated by the additions of a generation notoriously indifferent to the aspects of humane learning which fascinated the men of the age that built and so nearly completed it.

GENERAL INDEX

- Aachen, Carolingian Rotunda of, 91.
 Abernethy (Perth), camp at, 79, 80.
 Abingdon Abbey (Berks.), Titulus from, 48.
 Accounts, medieval household, 108, 109.
 Achonry (Co. Sligo), see of, 22.
 Aghadée (Eire), cathedral at, 16.
 Agricola, campaigns of, 78.
 Alcobaça (Portugal), cloister lavatory at, 97.
 Alesia (Côte d'Or), *murus Gallicus* at, 72.
 All Cannings Cross (Wilts.), 64, 67.
 Allcroft, Hadrian, 62, 82.
 Almondbury (Yorks.), earthwork at, 78.
 Alnwick (Northumberland), chantry of St. Mary at, 110; abbey at, 110, 111.
 Alnwick, William, Bishop of Lincoln, 98-112; will of, 101, 110-112.
 Amesbury (Wilts.), Titulus of Abbey, 43, 49.
 Anglo-Saxon (Christian): sculptured stones, 55, 56.
 Annaghdown (Eire), see of, 22.
 Appleby (Westmorland), churches at, 9.
 Arc, Joan of, trial of, 99.
 Ardert (Kerry), cathedral of, 22 (plan), 23-24.
 Ardmore (Eire), cathedral church of, 16.
 Armagh (Eire) cathedral church of, 17.
 Armour: on a brass of John Statham, 85.
 Arrowheads, Iron Age, 75.
 Art: notes on the origins of Hiberno-Saxon, 58.
 Arthurian cycle, 53.
 Arundel (Sussex), Titulus of St. Nicholas, 52.
 Ascheton, Abbot of Peterborough, 108.
 Atherton (Lancs.), church at, 30.
 Avaricum (Bourges) (Cher), siege of, 69.
 Avranches (Normandy), *murus Gallicus* at Le Petit Celland, 72.

 Bardney Abbey (Lincs.), 101, 107: Titulus from, 50.
 Barling Abbey (Essex), article on, 54, 55: Court House at, 54: Titulus from, 48.
 Barnack (Northants.), note on Christ in Majesty at, 58.
 Batalha (Portugal), cloister lavatory at, 97.
 Bates, Cadwallader, 98.
 Bath (Somerset), cathedral, 7: Titulus of St. Peter, 44, 50.
 Battering-rams, use of, 74, 75.
 Battle (Sussex), Titulus of Abbey, 47, 49: cloister lavatory at, 92, 94 (plan), 93.
 Bede-rolls: 40-53, 86.
 Bedfordshire, see Dunstable.
 Beeleigh Abbey (Essex), monograph on, 55.
 Bekynnton, Bishop of Wells, Register of, 85.
 Bekynnton, Thomas, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 110.
 Belvoir (Leics.), Titulus of St. Mary, 50.
 Benedict, Abbot of Peterborough, 113.
 Berkshire, see Abingdon; Eton; Reading; Silchester; Wallingford; Windsor.
 Bersu, Dr. Gerhard, 72.
 Beverley, John, Canon of Lincoln, 106.
 Beverley Minster (Yorks.), 119.
 Bickerton (Cheshire), camp at, 78.
 Biddenden (Kent), 107.
 Binham (Norfolk), 100.
 Bishop Auckland (Durham), Great Hall of Palace at, 7.
 Blyth Priory (Notts.), Titulus from, 45, 48.
 Bony, Jean, 10, 11.
 Bourne Abbey (Lincs.), 107.
 Bows, use of, 74, 75.
 Brakspear, Sir Harold, 91, 94, 96.
 Brampton Bryan (Herefords.), church at, 8.
 Brash, R. R., 19.
 Brasses, monumental: R. Clerk, 90; at Finchley, 89; J. Gaynesford, 85; at Morley, 84-86; at Recall, 88; T. Sanny, 89; at Shipton-under-Wychwood, 89; at York, 88.
 Breadsall Priory (Derby), 85.
 Breadsall, Thomas, 85.
 Bredon-on-the-Hill (Worcs.), camp at, 75.
 Bredon (Glos.), Titulus of St. Mary, 48.
 Bredon-on-the-Hill (Leics.), article on carved stones at, 56.
 Bricet Magna (Suffolk), Titulus of St. Leonard, 50.
 Bridlington (Yorks.), Titulus of St. Mary, 50.
 Brighton (Sussex), font in St. Nicholas, 95.
 Brighthelmston (Rutland), 106.
 Brooch, bronze, Le Tène Ic, 80.
 Brough (Yorks.), castle at, 8.
 Brougham (Westmorland), chapel and church at, 8.
 Bruno, founder of the Carthusian Order, bed-roll of, 41-2, 53.
 Buckden (Hunts.), manor of, 104, 105, 108.
 Buckinghamshire, see Wooburn.
 Bulleid, Dr. A., 64.
 Burford (Oxon.), priory at, 6.
 Burghead (Moray), *murus Gallicus* at, 79, 80.
 Burton-on-Trent (Staffs.), Titulus of Abbey, 43, 48.
 Bushe-Fox, J. P., 63.
 Bury St. Edmunds (Suffolk), Titulus of Abbey, 52; monastery, 100, 109.

 Caen (Calvados), Abbey of La Trinité, 42.
 Caesar, Julius, description of the term *murus Gallicus* by, 69, 70.
 Cambridge: article on No. 5 Market Hill, 60.
 King's College, foundation of, 104, 110.
 Magdalene College, foundation of, 110.
 St. Giles, Barnwell, Titulus from, 50.
 Trinity College, fountain in, 97.
 Cambridgeshire, see Cambridge; Ely; Thorney.
 Canterbury (Kent), article on St. Augustine's church, 56; cathedral, 6; cloister lavatory, at, 93; Tituli from, 47, 49.
 Carent, William, tomb of, 85.
 Cashel (Eire), cathedral of, 17, 23.
 Catapults, 75.
 Cerne Abbey (Dorset), Titulus from, 49.
 Chalbury (Dorset), 65.
 Chantry chapels: 85, 86.
 Chapels of ease in Leics., 103.
 Charlton (Kent), church at, 8.

- Chassenay (Loire), excavations in the Crêt Châtelard, 72.
 Cheshire, *see* Bickerton; Eddisbury.
 Childe, Professor V. G., 63, 77, 78.
 Chilham Castle (Kent), article on an early Hall at, 56.
 Chitty, Miss Lily F., 74.
 Christ, note on a representation at Barnack, 58.
 Cissbury (Sussex), earthwork at, 69.
 Clapham, Sir Alfred, 94, 96, memoir, 1; bibliography, 54-61.
 Clare Abbey (Suffolk), 30.
 Clerk, Robert, palimpsest brass of, 90.
 Clerkenwell: St John of Jerusalem, article on, 55.
 Clifford, Lady Anne, 8.
 Clonfert (Co. Galway), cathedral of, 16, 19 (plan), 22, 30.
 Clonmacnois (Co. Offaly), cathedral at, 16, 17-18 (plan).
 Cloyne (Co. Cork), cathedral of, 17, 35 (plan), 36.
 Cluny: article on monastery, 57; cloister lavatory in Abbey, 92.
 Cockersand Abbey (Lancs.), article on, 54.
 Colchester (Essex), note on a carved marble lion from, 56; Titulus of Holy Trinity, 52.
 Colstone, Thomas, notary public, 105.
 Comb, bone, 80.
 Conin, Bishop Nicholas, 33.
 Connell, Great (Co. Kildare), abbey of, 26.
 Cook, G. H., 85, 89.
 Cooper, Austin, drawing by, 24, 37, 39.
 Corfe Castle (Dorset), memorial tablet at, 89.
 Cork, Cathedral of St. Finbarr at, 28.
 Corley (Warks.), camp at, 78, 79.
 Cornwall: Iron Age pottery from, 67; multi-vallate camps in, 76.
 Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, 7.
 Cotton, Mrs. M. Aylwin, 69, 71.
 Council for British Archaeology, 65.
 Coventry (Warks.), Abbey, 30; Titulus from, 45, 47.
 Cranage, Dr. D. H. S., 94.
 Crosses, processional: 111.
 Crowhurst (Surrey), brass of John Gaynesford at, 85.
 Crowland (Linca.), Titulus of Abbey, 46, 52, 101, 107.
 Curie, Dr. A. O., 65.
 Curteys, William, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds, 100.
 Curwen, Dr. E. C., 65.
 Dartford (Kent), article on the Priory and Manor of, 56.
 Daundy, Edmund, chantry of, 85, 86.
 de Beer, E. S., 5.
 de Bruyne, M., 118.
 d'Elboux, R. H., 89.
 de Lacy, Hugh, erection of castle by, 26.
 de Mapilton, Bishop Hugh, 33, 35.
 Depyng, John, Canon of Lincoln, 105, 106.
 Derby, John, Canon of Lincoln, 106, 107.
 Derbyshire, *see* Breadsall; Morley; Wingfield.
 Dereham, West (Norfolk), bede-roll of John Wigenhole, Abbot of, 40.
 Devon, *see* Exeter.
 Dineley, Thomas, drawing by, 24.
 Dorchester Abbey (Oxon.), 107.
 Dorset, *see* Cerne; Chalbury; Corfe; Maiden Castle; Milton; Poundbury; Shaftesbury; Sherborne.
 Dove cotes, medieval, 91, 96.
 Dublin: cathedrals of Christ Church and St. Patrick, 16.
 Duclair (France), Belgic camp at, 76.
 Duffield, Thomas, Canon of Lincoln, 106.
 Duffy, A. R., 83, 97.
 Dummer (Hants.), brass of Robert Clerk at, 90.
 Dunbrody Abbey (Ireland), lavatory at, 96.
 Dundrennan Abbey (Kirkcudbright), lavatory at, 96.
 Dun Mor (Perth), camp at, 79, 80.
 Dumow, Little (Essex), Priory church, article on, 55.
 Dunstable (Heds.), priory at, 13.
 Durham: cloister lavatory at, 91, plan, 93, 95, 96.
 Durham County, *see* Bishop Auckland; Durham; Monkwearmouth.
 Earthworks, 63.
 Eddisbury camp (Cheshire), 78.
 Edgerston (Roxburghshire), camp at, 78.
 Eire, *see* Achonry; Aghadoc; Annaghdown; Ardfer; Ardmore; Armagh; Cashel; Clare; Clonfert; Clonmacnois; Cloyne; Connell, Great; Cork; Dublin; Dunbrody; Emly; Ferns; Glendalough; Inistoge; Kildare; Kilkenny; Killagha; Killaloe; Kilmacduagh; Kilmalkedar; Leighlin; Limerick; Mellifont; Newtown Trim; Ross Carbery; Scattery; Tuam; Waterford.
 Elmham (Norfolk), article on the Saxon Cathedral of, 56.
 Elfrington, H., 22.
 Ely (Cambs.), Titulus of St. Peter and St. Etheldreda, 51.
 Emly (Co. Limerick), cathedral of, 24.
 Épernon (Eure-et-Loire), Priory of St. Thomas at, 12.
 Essex, *see* Barking; Beleigh; Colchester; Dunmow; Havering; Hedingham; Lee; Pleshy; Stratford-by-Bow; West Thurrock.
 Eton College (Berks.), foundation of, 110.
 Evelyn, John, 5, 6.
 Evesham Abbey (Worcs.), 10; Titulus from, 44, 47.
 Exeter (Devon.), Titulus of St. Mary and St. Peter, 43; of St. Nicholas Priory, 44; cloister lavatory at, 92, 96; plan, 93.
 Eye (Suffolk), Titulus of St. Peter, 52.
 Eynsham (Oxon.), Titulus of Abbey, 49.
 Fallow, T. M., 16, 24, 26, 28, 30, 35, 37.
 Fécamp (Seine Inférieure), Belgic camp at, 76.
 Ferns (Co. Wexford), cathedral at, 36-9, 38 (plan).
 Field, Bishop Thomas, inscription to, 27.
 Field, H. E., 85.
 Finavon (Forfar), camp at, 79, 80.
 Finchley (Middlesex), memorial tablet at, 89.
 Fontenay (France), cloister lavatory at, 95, plan, 93.
 Forgandenny (Perth), camp at, 79, 80.

- Fotheringhay (Northants.), 101, 107.
 Fountains Abbey (Yorks.), article on, 60.
 Fox, Sir Cyril, 64.
 France: *muri Gallici* in, 70, 71, 72. *See also*
 Alesia; Bourges; Avranches; Caen; Chass-
 enay; Duclair; Épernon; Fécamp; Fontenay;
 Huelgoat; La Charité-sur-Loire; Les Jogasses;
 Le Thoronet; Luzoch; Marmoutier; Paris.
 Fuller, J. F., architect, 26.
- Gardner, Willoughby, 64.
 Garrard, George, 5.
 Gaynesford, John, brass of, 85.
 Genealogies: *see* Statham.
 Germany: *muri Gallici* in, 70, 72.
 Glass, stained, at Liddington, 105.
 Glastonbury (Som.), Abbey, 13, 32; laver
 from, 97; Titulus from, 44, 51; article on
 excavations at, 36, 57; Lake-Village, 64.
 Glencorse (Midlothian), camp at, 79, 80.
 Glendalough (Co. Wicklow), cathedral of, 16.
 Gloucester: Cathedral, 5, 10; cloister lavatory
 at, 92; Titulus from, 97.
 Gloucestershire, *see* Breedon; Gloucester;
 Tewkesbury; Winchcombe.
 Godfrey, Walter H., 6, 91.
 Goldsborough (Yorks.), 99.
 Gore, Bishop Hugh, 33.
 Graham, Dr. Rose, 92, 97.
 Grandmontine Order and its Houses in England,
 56.
 Gray, H. St. George, 64.
 Gray, William, Bishop of Lincoln, 102.
 Groombridge (Kent), chapel at, 8.
- Hallstatt culture, 67, 68, 72, 75, 77.
 Hampshire, *see* Dunmer; Hengistbury Head;
 Ramsey; Romsey; St. Catherine's Hill;
 Wherwell; Wilton; Winchester.
 Hampshire Field Club, 65.
 Harley, Sir Robert, 8.
 Haverfordwest Priory (Pemb.), article on, 55.
 Havering Palace (Essex), article on, 54.
 Hawkes, Professor C. F. C., 65, 66, 68.
 Hedingham (Essex), bede-roll of Lucy, Prioress
 of, 40.
 Hencken, Mrs. T. C., 65, 67.
 Hengistbury Head (Hants.), 63, 64.
 Henstridge (Som.), tomb of William Carent at, 85.
 Henry, Miss F., 19, 20.
 Herefordshire, *see* Brampton Bryan; Sutton
 Walls.
 Hertford Palace, article on, 54.
 Hertfordshire, *see* St. Albans.
 Hill, A., 22, 24.
 Hillingdon (Middlesex), church at, 8.
 Hinckley (Leics.), Titulus of Abbey, 49.
 Holme (Cumb.), Titulus of St. Benet's, 46, 48.
 Honnecourt, Viâard d', 118.
 Hope, Sir William St. John, 40, 91, 94, 95, 96.
 Horsey, Sir John, 97.
 Huelgoat (Brittany), Iron Age camp at, 72, 73.
 Hughes, Harold, 64.
 Hulne (Northumb.), 110.
 Hunsbury (Northants.), hill-fort at, 69.
 Huntingdon: Titulus from St. Mary's, 46.
 Huntingdonshire, *see* Buckden; Huntingdon.
- Inistoge Priory (Kilkenny), 30.
 Ipswich (Suffolk), St. Lawrence's church at, 86.
 Ireland: Cistercian Order in, article on, 57;
 Hiberno-Saxon art, 58. *See also* Eire.
 Iron Age, classification of British, 64, 65, 66, 67;
 objects found in Scottish hill-forts, 80-81.
 Irthlingborough (Northants.), 107.
 Irvine, J. T., 118, 119.
 Isip, John, Abbot of Westminster, Obituary
 Roll of, 40.
- Jedburgh Abbey (Roxburgh), 12, 13, 32.
 Jet objects, Iron Age, 80, 81.
 Jones, Inigo, 6, 7.
- Kent, *see* Biddenden; Canterbury; Charlton;
 Chilham; Dartford; Groombridge; Lesnes;
 Malling; Oldbury; Plumstead; Queens-
 borough; Rochester.
 Kenyon, Dr. K. M., 65, 67, 81.
 Kildare: cathedral of, 17, 24, 25 (plan), 26.
 Kilkenny: cathedral, 16, 33, 34 (plan), 37.
 Killagha (Kerry), abbey at, 30.
 Killaloe (Co. Clare), cathedral of, 17 (plan).
 Kilmacduagh (Co. Galway), cathedral of, 16, 17,
 21-22 (plan).
 Kilmalkedar (Kerry), chancel at, 23.
 Kyme, South (Lines), early carved stones from
 Church at, 55.
- La Charité-sur-Loire (France), cloister lavatory
 at, 92.
 Lamps, stone, 80.
 Lancashire, *see* Atherton; Cockersand.
 Langton, John, Bishop of St. David's, 110.
 La Tène culture, 67, 68, 72, 75, 77.
 Laud, Archbishop, 5, 6.
 Lavatories, cloister, 91-97; comparative plans,
 93.
 Leask, H. G., 17, 96.
 Leeds (Yorks.), St. John's church at, 8.
 Lee (Essex), Priory, article on, 55.
 Lefebure, F. A., 41.
 Leicester Abbey: 101.
 Leicestershire, *see* Belvoir; Breedon-on-the-
 Hill; Hinckley; Staunton Harold.
 Leighlin (Co. Carlow), cathedral of, 17, 26,
 27 (plan); Priory of St. Stephen at, 27.
 Lenthall, William, 6.
 Les Jogasses (Marne), 68.
 Lesnes Abbey (Kent), articles on, 54, 55.
 Le Thoronet (France), cloister lavatory at, 95, 96.
 Lewes Abbey (Sussex), Titulus from, 43, 49;
 cloister lavatory at, 92, 94, 95, 96, plan 93, 97.
 Liddell, Miss D., 65.
 Liddington (Rutland), Bede house at, 104,
 105, 108.
 Liège (Belgium), cathedral at, 116.
 Limerick: cathedral of, 17, 23, 28, 29 (plan),
 30, 36.
 Lincoln: Bishop's Palace, 104, 105; Cathedral,
 115-120; diocese of, in 15th century, 106;
 Titulus of St. Mary, 45, 50.
 Lincolnshire, *see* Bardney; Crowland; Kyme,
 South; Lincoln; Nettleham; Oxney; Slea-
 ford; Spalding; Tattershall; Thornton.

- Linlithgow Palace (West Lothian), fountain at, 97.
 Lion, carved marble, *see* Colchester.
 Lollards in Norfolk, 100.
 London: Gothic tradition in, 6; report on the structure of the Merchant Taylors' Hall, 60; topography of Dominican Priory, 54.
 Bishopsgate: parish of St. Helens, 56.
 Lincoln's Inn Chapel, 6.
 St. Alban, Wood Street, 6.
 St. Catherine Cree, 6.
 St. Dunstan in the East, 7.
 St. Giles, Cripplegate, 4.
 St. Mary, Aldermary, 7.
 St. Michael, Cornhill, 7.
 The Tower, article on, 54; Abbey of Tower Hill, 55.
 Westminster Abbey: Henry VII's Chapel, 4; article on discoveries in the Nave, 58, 100.
 Luzoch (Lot), camp of l'Imperual at, 77.
 Lyhart, Walter, Bishop of Norwich, 101.
 Lynn Regis (Norfolk), church at, 30.

 Maastricht cathedral, 116.
 Macworth, John, Dean of Lincoln, 107.
 Maiden Castle (Dorset), 63, 67, 68, 69.
 Malling (Kent), Titulus of St. Mary, 47, 53.
 Malmesbury (Wilts.), Titulus of St. Mary and St. Aldhelm, 44, 50; cloister lavatory at, 92.
 Malvern (Worce.), Titulus of Abbey, 44.
 Manching (Bavaria), *muris Gallicis* at, 72.
 Manuscripts, *see* Statham Book of Hours.
 Marmoutier (France), Abbey of, 12.
 'Marnian' culture: in Sussex, 67, 68; in Dorset, 68.
 Marrier, Dom Martin, 96.
 Matilda, Abbess of La Trinité, Caen, bede-roll of, 41, 42-47, 53.
 Mayor, A., 83.
 Melford, Long (Suffolk), inscriptions on church at, 88.
 Mellifont Abbey (Ireland), lavatory at, 96, plan 93.
 Melrose Abbey (Roxburgh), lavatory at, 96.
 Mere, Abbot Albert, 97.
 Merton Priory (Surrey), Titulus from, 52.
 Middlesex, *see* Finchley; Hillingdon; Syon.
 Milan (Italy), cathedral at, 117.
 Milton Abbey (Dorset), Titulus from, 43, 51, 53.
 Monifieth (Forfar), camp at, 79, 80.
 Monkwearmouth (Durham), article on two carved stones at, 60.
 Montacute (Somerset), Titulus of St. Peter, 44, 51.
 Montague, James, Bishop, 7.
 Moore, Dean Thomas, chantry of, 86.
 Moreton, Bishop William, 26.
 Morley (Derbyshire), brasses in church at, 84, 85.
 Muchelney Abbey (Somerset), Titulus from, 44, 50.
Muri Gallici, 69, 70, 75, 76, 78, 79; distribution of, 70, 71, 78 (map).
 Myres, J. N. L., 65.

 Names, Christian, of Anglo-Saxon origin, 53.
 Neale, Archbishop, 8.
 Nettleham (Lincs.), manor of, 104, 105, 108.

 Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Northumb.), St. Nicholas church, 7.
 Newstead (Roxburghshire), abbey, 5.
 Newtown Trim (Ireland), church at, 17.
 Nonsuch Palace (Surrey), article on, 54.
 Norfolk, *see* Bingham; Dereham, West; Elmham; Lynn Regis; Norwich; Thetford; Wymondham.
 Norman, Dr. Philip, 6.
 Northamptonshire, *see* Barnack; Fotheringhay; Hunsbury; Irthlingborough; Peterborough.
 Northumberland, *see* Alnwick; Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 Norwich (Norfolk), 99-101; Titulus of Holy Trinity, 45, 48.
 Nostell (Yorks.), Titulus of St. Oswald, 50.
 Nottingham (Notts.), Titulus of Holy Trinity, Lenton, 44, 49.

 Oldbury (Kent), Iron Age camp at, 76, 80, 81.
 O'Neil, B. H. St. J., 65.
 Otzenhausen (Rhine Province), *muris Gallicis* of the Ring of, 72.
 Oxford, examples of 17th-century Gothic in, 5; Titulus from, 49.
 Brasenose College, 6.
 Cathedral, 12, 13.
 Christ Church, 6.
 Exeter College, 5.
 Lincoln College, 5.
 Oriel College, 5.
 St. John's College, 6.
 Schools Quadrangle, 5.
 University College, 6.
 Wadham College, 5.
 Oxfordshire: Burford; Dorchester; Eynsham; Oxford; Shipton-under-Wychwood.
 Oxney (Lincs.), monastery at, 107.

 Packer, John, 8.
 Paris (France), Laver at St. Martin des Champs, 96.
 Partrich, Peter, of Lincoln, 107.
 Peers, Sir Charles, 113, 115, 117, 119.
 Pendragon (Westmorland), castle at, 8.
 Perkins, J. B. Ward, 67, 76.
 Pershore (Worce.), abbey at, 10; Titulus from, 44, 47.
 Peterborough (Northants.): Cathedral, 113-120, 101, 107; laver from, 97; Titulus from, 52.
 Petit Colland, *see* Avranches.
 Piggott, Professor and Mrs. Stuart, 65, 68.
 Pins: enamelled, 80; ring-headed, 80.
 Plato, system of ratios applied to architecture, 117.
 Pleshy Castle (Essex), article on, 55.
 Plumstead (Kent), church at, 8.
 Pontefract (Yorks.), Titulus of St. John, 50.
 Portugal, cloister lavatories in, 91, 97.
 Poundbury (Dorset), 65.
 Power, F. T. A., 119.

 Queenborough Castle (Kent), article on, 55.
 Querna, 80.


- Ramsey (Hants.), Titulus of Abbey, 46, 48; Abbey, 101, 107.
 Ratios, arithmetical, applied to architecture, 117, 118.
 Reading Abbey (Berks.), Titulus of, 52; well at, 94.
 Records, diocesan : Lincoln, 102.
 Ricall (Yorks.), brass at, 88.
 Rice, James, tomb of, 33.
 Richardson, Miss K. M., 65.
 Ring, finger-, Iron Age, 80.
 Robert, Abbot of Lindsey, 113.
 Rochester (Kent), Titulus of St. Andrew, 46, 49.
 Roman : Mausolea of the Cart-wheel type, article on, 55.
 Ramsey Abbey (Hants.), 12, 13, 32; Titulus of St. Mary, 51.
 Ross Carbery (Co. Cork), cathedral of, 19, 28, 30.
 Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments, 62.
 Rutland, *see* Brighthurst; Liddington.
- Sacheverell, Henry, monument to, 84, 88.
 St. Albans (Herts.), Titulus of Abbey, 46; Abbey, 100, 109.
 St. Catharine's Hill (Hants.), 65.
 St. Dogmaels Abbey (Cardigan), article on, 55.
 St. James, Westminster, hospital of, 99.
 St. Legerian, 26.
 St. Leger, Bishop Geoffrey, 33.
 St. Maidoc, 36, 37, 39.
 St. William of York, representation of, on glass, 105.
 Salisbury (Wills.), cathedral, 5; Titulus of St. Mary, 43, 51.
 Sanders, Bishop Mathew, 27.
 Sanny, Thomas, brass of, 89.
 Saxl, Professor F., 115.
 Scattery (Co. Clare), cathedral of, 16.
 Scotland : *muri Gallici* in, 70, 77, 79. *See also* Abernethy; Burghead; Dundrennan; Dun Mor; Edgerston; Finavon; Forgandenny; Glencorse; Jedburgh; Lamlithgow; Melrose; Monifieth; Newstead.
 Scott, Sir Gilbert, 5.
 Scrope, Stephen, Archdeacon of Richmond, 99, 112.
 Selby (Yorks.), Titulus of St. Germans, 45, 48.
 Shaftesbury (Dorset), Titulus of Abbey, 43, 51.
 Sherborne (Dorset), Titulus of Abbey, 49; cloister lavatory from, 97.
 Shipton-under-Wychwood, (Oxon.), brass at, 89.
 Shirley, Sir Robert, 8.
 Shropshire, *see* Wenlock, Much; Wroxeter.
 Silchester (Berks.), 64.
 Sleaford Castle (Lines.), 104, 105, 108.
 Slings, use of, 74, 75, 76.
 Somerset, *see* Bath; Glastonbury; Henstridge; Montacute; Muchelney; Wells.
 'South-Eastern B' culture, 67.
 Spalding (Lines.), Titulus of St. Mary, 46, 52.
 Spain, cloister lavatories in, 91.
 Staffordshire, *see* Burton-on-Trent; Tutbury.
 Statham Book of Hours, 83-90; Pedigree, 84.
 Sraunton Harold (Leics.), chapel at, 8.
 Stevens, C. E., 65.
 Stratford-by-Bow Abbey (Essex), Titulus from, 52.
 Street, G. E., architect, 26.
 Suffolk, *see* Bury St. Edmunds; Clare; Eye; Ipswich; Melford, Long.
 Surrey, *see* Crowhurst; Merton; Nonsuch Palace; Waverley Abbey.
 Sussex, fieldwork in, 65. *See also* Arundel; Battle; Brighton; Cissbury; Lewes.
 Sutton Walls (Herefords.), Iron Age pottery from, 67.
 Switzerland : *muri Gallici* in, 70.
 Syon (Middlesex), nunnery at, 98, 99.
- Tattershall (Lines.), foundation of college at, 110.
 Tewkesbury Abbey (Glos.), presbytery at, 10-15; Titulus from, 44, 47.
 Thetford (Norfolk), Titulus of St. Mary, 52.
 Thompson, Professor A. Hamilton, 98.
 Thorney (Cambs.), Titulus of Abbey, 52.
 Thornycroft, Wallace, 77.
 Thornton Abbey (Lines.), 101; *Guide* to, 60.
 Thornton, Robert, Archdeacon of Bedford, 106, 107.
 Thurrock, West (Essex), article on St. Clement's church at, 55.
 Tuam (Co. Galway), cathedral of, 16, 20 (plan), 22, 26, 30.
 Tutbury (Staffs.), Titulus of St. Mary, 45, 48.
 Twyer, Thomas, of Brighthurst, 106.
- Venet, the, 75, 76.
 Vestments, ecclesiastical, 111.
Vetusta Monumenta, 115, 116.
 Vincent, Gabriel, 9.
 Viollet-le-Duc, 95, 96.
 Vitalis, Abbot of Savigny, bede-roll of, 41, 47-53.
 Vitruvius, 118.
- Wales, *see* Haverfordwest; St. Dogmaels; Whitland.
 Wallingford (Berks.), Titulus of Holy Trinity, 52.
 Walpole, Sir Horace, 5, 9.
 Warwick, St. Mary, 9.
 Warwickshire, *see* Corley; Coventry; Warwick.
 Waterford : cathedral of, 17, 30, 31 (plan), 32, 33, 37.
 Waverley Abbey (Surrey), cloister lavatory at, 92.
 Weapons of attack, Early Iron Age, 74, 75.
 Webb, Geoffrey F., 113.
 Wellesley, Bishop Walter, 26.
 Wells Cathedral (Som.), 115.
 Wenlock, Much (Salop.), cloister lavatory at, 92, plan, 93, 94, 95.
 Westropp, T. J., 28, 36.
 Westmorland : Appleby; Brougham.
 Wheathampstead, Abbot, 100.
 Wheeler, Dr. R. E. M., 62.
 Wherwell (Hants.), Titulus of Abbey, 43.
 Whitby Abbey (Yorks.), *Guide* to, 60.
 Whitland Abbey (Carmarthen), article on, 55.
 Wigenhale, John, Abbot of West Dereham, bede-roll of, 40.
 Wilson, Sir William, 9.
 Wilton (Hants.), Titulus of St. Mary and St. Edith, 43, 49, 53.

- Wiltshire, *see* All Cannings Cross; Amesbury; Malmesbury; Salisbury; Woodbury, Little.
- Winchcombe (Glos.), Titulus of St. Mary and St. Kenelm, 44.
- Winchester (Hants.), Tituli of monastic establishments at, 42, 51, 53.
- Windsor (Berks.), 6.
- Wingfield (Derby), 104.
- Wittkower, Dr. Rudolf, 118.
- Wittnauer (Switzerland), earthwork at, 72.
- Wooburn (Bucks.), manor of, 104, 105.
- Woodbury, Little (Wilts.), Iron Age pottery from, 68.
- Worcester, Titulus of St. Mary, 47.
- Worcestershire, Iron Age pottery from, 67.
See also Brodon-on-the-Hill; Evesham; Malvern; Pershore; Worcester.
- Wren, Sir Christopher, 6, 7, 9.
- Wroxeter (Salop.), 63, 64.
- Wymondham (Norfolk), Titulus of St. Mary, 50.
- York: All Saints, North Street, brass in, 88; Minster, 5; Tituli from, 44, 45, 48, 50, 53; the York Virgin, article on, 60.
- Yorkshire, *see* Almondbury; Beverley; Bridlington; Fountains; Goldsborough; Leeds; Nostell; Pontefract; Ricall; Selby; Whitby.
- Zurich, Congress of Prehistoric and Proto-historic Sciences at, 69.



Commemoration Vols.
Archaeology - Essays

✓



CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY,
NEW DELHI
Issue record

Catalogue No. 082/G1a - 6219

Author— Clapham, Alfred.

Title— Memorial volume to Sir Alfred
Clapham.

Borrower No.

Date of Issue

Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.